FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

4 Jun 87 FBIS-SOV-87-107 i

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Obukhov Sees Prospects for Fall INF Agreement [IZVESTIYA 28 May] AA 1
Moscow TV Cites Shultz on Venice Meeting, INF AA 4
U.S. Official in Azerbaijan Notes Geneva Progress AA 5
USSR, U.S. Arms Control Experts Meet in Moscow AA 5
Kolesnichenko on NATO Reaction to Berlin Proposals AA 6
NATO, Warsaw Pact Call for 'Opposite' Responses AA 7
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on Medium-Range Missiles Issue [Nikanorov, 24 May] AA 8

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

International Physicians Congress Meets in Moscow CC 1
Gorbachev Sends Greetings CC 1
1st Day Activities [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 May] CC 2
Gorbachev Meets Delegates [PRAVDA 3 Jun] CC 5
IZVESTIYA on Talks, U.S. Role [2 Jun] CC 8

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reagan Departs for 'Big Seven' Meeting in Italy [Turkatenko] A 1
Arrival, Predeparture Interview A 1
Businessman Cites White House Role in Iran Arms Deal A 2
Papers Cite Motives for 'Intrusion' of U.S. Cruiser A 2
Bragin in PRAVDA [23 May] A 2
Mozgovoy in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA [23 May] A 3
Dobrynin Holds Talks With USIA Director Wick A 4
Anatoliy Gromyko Sees Changing U.S. Views of USSR [IZVESTIYA 26 May] A 5
Gerasimov-Rather 'Dialogue' on Understanding Cited A 8
Americans' Varied Reactions to Restructuring Assessed [Zvyagin] A 8

CHINA

Wu Xueqian Pledges Support for Frontline States [IZVESTIYA 2 Jun] B 1
Publishing Commission Drafts Law on Press Activity [TRUD 26 May] B 1
Daily Notes Opening of Electronics Exhibition [SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 27 May] B 2
USSR, PRC Publishing Bodies Sign Protocol [PRAVDA 29 May] B 2

NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA

Afghan Leader Announces Extension of Cease-Fire E 1
Multilateral Talks on Gulf Shipping Safety Proposed E 1
U.S. Holds 'No Scruples' in Gulf Plans [Shabayev] E 2
U.S. Fuels 'Confrontation' With USSR Over Gulf E 3
[Matveyev in IZVESTIYA 4 Jun]
Government Condolences Sent on Karami Death [PRAVDA 2 Jun] E 4
TASS Commentary Sees Israel Behind Karami Death [Vasilyev] E 5
Protocol Signed With India on Space Exploration E 5
Tehran Claims Part of 'Anti-Soviet Campaign' E 6
[Zaborin in MOSCOW NEWS 24 May]

EAST EUROPE

Gromyko Speaks to New CSSR Envoy on Pact Proposals G 1
Air Force Chief Yefimov Leaves for GDR G 1
Production Cooperation With Bulgaria Critiqued G 2
[Kalashnikof in TRUD 21 May]
Bulgaria's Zhivkov Meets FRG's Genscher in Bonn G 4
Romanian Media Surveyed on Gorbachev Visit G 5
[Lavrentyev]

WEST EUROPE

Further Reportage on FRG Pilot Landing Case H 1
Arbatov Discusses Case H 1
FRG Press Speculates on Motives H 1
FRG Fears Harm to Ties H 2
TASS Views Status of USSR-FRG Relations H 3
NOVOSTI Comments on Berlin Accord Anniversary [Hamburg DPA] H 4
'Foreign Policy Planning' Consultations With UK H 4

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Problems With Cuban Cooperation Project Aired I 1
[Bogomolov in PRAVDA 1 Jun]
Commentators Note Underground Chilean Publication I 4

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL

PRAVDA UKRAINY Profiles New KGB Chief Golushko [26 May] R 1
Former Chief Transfers [PRAVDA UKRAINY 26 May] R 1
PRAVDA Stresses Impact of Party Cadres' Example [25 May] R 1

Kuznetsov on New View of Democracy's 'Hard Process' R 3
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 May]
TV Panel Analyzes Reform, Personality Cults R 5
[Kuznetsov, Oyzerman, Kolesnikov, Bagramov, Filakova, Mednova]
MOSCOW NEWS Readers Join 'Real History' Debate [24 May] R 10

SCIENTIFIC

Academician Links Science, New Thinking, 'Glasnost' U 1
[Goldanskiy in NEW TIMES 11 May]
Briefs: New Personal Computer U 5

MILITARY

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Editorial on Responsibility [4 Jun] V 1
'Illusions' in Nuclear Age Military Thinking V 4
[Volkogonov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 May]

OBUKHOV SEES PROSPECTS FOR FALL INF AGREEMENT

PM280928 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 May 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with USSR Special Envoy A.A. Obukhov, deputy leader of the USSR delegation to the talks on nuclear and space arms by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Kuznetsov: "A. Obukhov: Agreement Can Be Reached by the Fall"; interview is datelined Geneva, date not specified]

[Text] Within the framework of the current round of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms discussions are continuing on the preparation of agreements on these issues. IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Kuznetsov asked Special Envoy A.A. Obukhov, deputy leader of the USSR delegation, to comment on the course of the negotiations.

Geneva -- [Obukhov] In many respects the current, eighth round is the decisive one. The sides are virtually at the point of concluding [storony vplotnuyu podoshli k zaklyucheniyu] a treaty on medium-range missiles in Europe. This is the most "advanced" issue. The Reykjavik meeting was undoubtedly of very great importance for its solution. It was Reykjavik that saw the elaboration of a formula providing for the elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe while retaining 100 warheads on such missiles for either side: for the USSR, in the Asian part of our country, and for the United States accordingly -- on its national territory. The task consists in arriving at the legal embodiment of the Reykjavik decisions.

We believe this work must be accomplished within a short period of time. We have agreed with the Americans to conduct matters intensively, without wasting time on recesses between rounds. If things keep moving, then in my view it is entirely possible to expect an agreed draft text of a medium-range missiles treaty to be available by the fall. The draft could be submitted for examination and signing at the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting [ocherednaya sovetsko-amerikanskaya vstrecha na vysshem urovne].

The conclusion of a medium-range missiles treaty would be of historic importance -- in the full sense of the word. A window would have been cut through into the sphere of real nuclear disarmament. There should be no procrastination. The opportunity which has presented itself to remove medium-range missiles from the nuclear arsenals must not be missed.

[Kuznetsov] Are there any factors still impeding the reaching of agreement?

[Obukhov] On our side -- none. Moreover, the Soviet Union has recently taken a number of exceptionally important steps aimed at eliminating the obstacles which the West has endeavored to erect. Thus, we were told that the linkage of medium-range missiles issues in one single package with strategic and space weapons hinders agreement. These objections were heeded, and the medium-range missiles have now been singled out of the complex of other problems under discussion in Geneva. We were also told that the medium-range missile problem could not be resolved without settling the question of operational and tactical missiles. We also heeded this position of our negotiating partners. On 27 April, seeking to bring the sides' positions together, the USSR delegation submitted a Soviet draft treaty on medium-range missiles which is in the nature of a compromise. Taken together, all this represents a fine foundation for practical movement on agreeing on formulations for inclusion in a joint draft treaty.

Naturally, a considerable amount of work lies ahead. The volume of documents is in itself large. For instance, the U.S. side has so far put on the negotiating table approximately 60 pages of legal text.

But this, of course, is not the main thing. The difficulties at the talks are created by the deliberate one-sidedness inherent in the U.S. draft on several important aspects. Much has been said and written, for instance, about the fact that, instead of eliminating their medium-range missiles in West Europe, the U.S. is insisting on the right to convert [pereoborudovaniye] them into other types of weapons, citing as a pretext the saving of resources. Also overtly inequitable is the U.S. proposal that the United States could, for a prolonged period of time, retain untouched its medium-range missile groupings in West Europe while only the Soviet Union would engage in reductions -- and under the surveillance of U.S. inspectors at that.

Close analysis indicates that the United States is seeking a reductions variant whereby U.S. medium-range missiles -- ballistic and cruise -- could altogether be taken outside the commitment to eliminate them. The Pershing-2s would be converted into Pershing-1Bs, that is, into shorter-range missiles, while the ground-launched cruise missiles would be moved onto ships or would be transformed into conventionally charged means. Moreover, all these possibilities are reserved exclusively for the United States. For the USSR there remains only the one alternative -- destroy the medium-range missiles. It is as if the United States is literally seeking to also push us into converting the medium-range missiles into other forms of SS-20 missile armaments -- intercontinental ballistic missiles, say, or conventionally armed missiles.

Naturally, this path would have nothing in common with the goals of disarmament. As soon as agreement is reached on eliminating Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, it must be pursued. Nor is the current U.S. claim to the right to place in Alaska the medium-range missiles remaining for the United States in any way dictated by the interests of reducing the danger of war.

Another example of the unconstructive U.S. approach is the rejection of a ban on new types of medium-range missiles, advocated by the Soviet side. The U.S. position in this respect it formulated in such a way that in effect only the U.S. side would have the right to new types of medium-range missiles, while the USSR would be satisfied only with what it already has.

It is clear that if there is to be constructive progress at the talks it is necessary for the aforementioned obstacles, created by the U.S. approach, to be removed. Time will tell whether the U.S. representatives' statements on their desire for an equal and effective accord will be backed up with concrete deeds.

[Kuznetsov] How difficult are questions of verification?

[Obukhov] The Soviet side attaches great significance to the monitoring of the fulfillment of any commitments adopted. We are in favor of strict, all-embracing verification, up to and including on-site inspections. But it goes without saying that this verification must apply equally to both sides. In this respect attempts by the U.S. side to exempt its own arms from appropriate verification -- through the implementation of reductions by the Soviet side alone in the first years of the treaty's operation -- cannot fail to arouse objections. Nor are matters helped by the overloading of U.S. proposals on verification with various kinds of minor and petty details which have nothing to do with the substance of the issues.

[Kuznetsov] How can the forceful Western press campaign against a possible accord on medium-range missiles be explained?

[Obukhov] Those who are against it cite various arguments, including some which are highly abstruse. They say, for instance, that the "zero option" on medium-range missiles in Europe will knock out a link in the NATO strategy of "flexible response," and then, they say, the system of "nuclear deterrence" will be at an end. But, first, despite the radical nature of the Reykjavik decision on medium-range missiles, it still does not mean the total elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe. That is unfortunate, of course, but it is a fact. Second, the aforementioned arguments confirm yet again that stability and security in the international arena must now be built not along the lines of the policy of strength which urges on the arms race and engenders fear and distrust between peoples, but along the lines of a lowering of the level of military confrontation in all avenues and the strengthening and development of cooperation among states on a peaceful basis. The "balance of nuclear terror" is a very slippery platform. It is possible at any moment to stumble from it into the abyss of a catastrophic war.

I admit that for certain Western politicians it is a difficult and sometimes painful process to break the habit of the old dogmas of nuclear diplomacy, but life will claim its due. Realism will triumph.

Let me add: The board in Western Europe is following hopefully the course of the Geneva talks. Tangible, positive results are expected from the delegations' work. We know this from many meetings with representatives of various organizations, journalists, and politicians who come to Geneva. Let met cite just one example. The USSR mission in Geneva recently received the text of a communique adopted by the Executive Committee of the International Organization of Miniers at a session in Bobigny (France). It expressed warm support for the USSR's line of achieving an accord on the elimination in the shortest possible time of all the Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles sited in Europe.

[Kuznetsov] Is there any progress in the other two groups at the talks -- on strategic offensive arms and on space?

[Obukhov] You are right to place these two problems together. There is an organic, indissoluble link between strategic offensive arms reductions and limitations in the sphere of space. The spread of the arms race to space would act as a catalyst on the continuation of the arms race on earth. There would simply be no question of radical reductions in strategic offensive arms. Constant reminders must be given of this, since work continues at an accelerated pace within the framework of the strategic defense initiative in the hope of acquiring for the United States a first-strike potential, that is, achieving military superiority. Of course, the USSR will not permit that.

But we are not in favor of spurring on the military rivalry. An effective accord ensuring the strengthening of the ABM Treaty and creating a reliable barrier to the penetration of strike arms into space would meet everyone's interests. Such an accord would create the necessary conditions for the implementation of the principle -- agreed at the highest level -- of 50-percent reductions in strategic offensive arms.

The Soviet side at the Geneva talks has submitted a draft "Key Provisions for Agreements" on the questions indicated. Along with a treaty on medium-range missiles, the "key provisions" document could be a subject for approval [predmet dlya utverzhdeniya] at a possible summit meeting.

How did the U.S. delegation respond to this constructive proposal of ours? On the question of strategic offensive arms, it has submitted a draft treaty, albeit an incomplete one with a large number of gaps. Outwardly it reproduces the Reykjavik formula for strategic offensive arms reduction -- to 1,600 ICBM's, SLBM's, and heavy bombers, with the number of charges on them being limited to 6,000 units. But here the analogy with Reykjavik basically ends. Thus the U.S. draft says nothing on the question of the limitation of sea-launched long-range cruise missiles. The question of establishing sublimits on ICBM and SLBM warheads is raised once again with a view to wrecking the established structure of the Soviet strategic offensive arms forces. Whereas with a view to achieving a compromise in Reykjavik the Soviet side accepted a reduction by one-half in the number of its heavy ICBM's, now the U.S. proposals are aimed at totally eliminating them. At the same time basically an entirely free hand is ensured for the implementation of U.S. military programs in strategic offensive arms. This alone is enough to demonstrate the unconstructive, one-sided nature of the U.S. approach.

In the sphere of space, the U.S. position looks no better. While agreeing not to withdraw from the ABM Treaty for 7 years, that is, through 1994, the United States would in effect like to emasculate the very essence of its commitment on this score. In accordance with its approach, during that period any work in the sphere of space-based ABM defense would be permitted, including tests of the corresponding devices in space. That is in direct contradiction to the letter and spirit of the ABM Treaty. After 1994 they propose to us that the ABM Treaty be eliminated entirely.

[Kuznetsov] In light of what has been said, how do the prospects look for work in this round?

[Obukhov] I will not repeat myself. Much work lies ahead, intensive work. We are in favor of progress in all three avenues. But I will say frankly, I pin the greatest hopes on the resolution of the question of medium-range missiles. Here there is a very real possibility of the conclusion of a full-scale treaty in the near future. But to realize that possibility, efforts are needed on both sides That is to say, on the U.S. side as well.

MOSCOW TV CITES SHULTZ ON VENICE MEETING, INF

OW031433 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1120 GMT 3 Jun 87

[From "The World Today" program, presented by Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State Shultz said on Tuesday that any concrete statement on the position of the leaders of the Western world on medium-range missiles should not be expected from the forthcoming regular meeting in Venice of the leaders of seven major capitalist countries of the world that will be held 8-9 June. I do not think, he said, that the group of participants in the summit meeting is suitable for attempting to give a response to proposals on nuclear medium-range missiles. He added that this issue will be discussed in Reykjavik, at the NATO Council session, in which ministers of foreign affairs of all the NATO countries will participate.

Honestly speaking, I do not quite understand this. After all, the heads of state will meet in Venice. Why cannot they, statesmen of such stature and high position -- why is this highest of levels unsuitable, as Shultz said, for solving this question, one of the most important and topical issues of the day?

Well, let us not engage in polemics with the secretary of state but rather take note of the desire of the United States -- which came out in his statements -- to nonetheless keep [sokhranit] part of its nuclear warheads on West German territory and to skillfully remove them from the inventory of those medium-range and operational and tactical missiles subject to reduction. For example, regarding the request to report on the U.S. reaction to the West German desire to keep Pershing 1A missiles on its territory, Shultz responded that the United States supports Bonn's position. As you know, we are talking about 72 missiles of this type with U.S. warheads that are under Washington's control.

From the very beginning in Geneva, Shultz said, we have adhered to a position according to which talks between the United States and the USSR extend exclusively to the systems of only these two countries, while the systems of third countries are not objects of the talks -- neither the British, French, nor Pershing systems.

U.S. OFFICIAL IN AZERBAIJAN NOTES GENEVA PROGRESS

LD021516 Moscow TASS in English 1504 GMT 2 Jun 87

[Text] Baku June 2 TASS -- An international conference, "bilateral and collective talks on disarmament and their relationship", opened in the capital of Soviet Azerbaijan, Transcaucasus, today. It brought together the heads of delegations at the Geneva conference on disarmament, diplomats and political scientists from 28 countries: The USSR, the United States, Australia, Bulgaria, developing Asian, African and Latin American states.

The conference, organised by the U.N. Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) with the assistance of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, focuses on problems of ensuring universal security.

Any military doctrine adhered to by one or another side should take into account the other side's security interests, David Emery, deputy director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, told TASS. Joint progress made by the United States and the USSR at the Geneva talks with an eye to reaching accords is viewed as the most suitable way of scaling down the risk of war.

He noted that progress had been achieved lately and expressed the hope that the USSR and the United States came close to solving the issue of reducing the number of nuclear missiles.

USSR, U.S. ARMS CONTROL EXPERTS MEET IN MOSCOW

LD020630 Moscow TASS in English 0617 GMT 2 Jun 87

[Text] Moscow June 2 TASS -- The fifth meeting of Soviet and U.S. experts on arms control issues ended in Moscow on Monday with the adoption of a joint statement urging the governments of the Soviet Union and the United States to keep the ABM Treaty.

At a press conference here, the participants in the meeting emphasised that the Soviet-U.S. treaty had stood the test of time and should be preserved.

It was pointed out that the treaty promoted stronger strategic stability and made it possible to achieve progress in the cause of limiting strategic offensive arms.

KOLESNICHENKO ON NATO REACTION TO BERLIN PROPOSALS

LD032151 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Jun 87

[Report by Tomas Kolesnichenko identified by caption as "editor of the PRAVDA International Department;" from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The political and public circles of various countries continue to comment on the results of the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact member states. [video shows Tomas Kolesnichenko speaking to camera]

[Kolesnichenko] Good day, comrades. The military experts and the politicians do indeed now have something to study. After all, realistic proposals were put forward in Berlin, proposals which are directed toward the most important goal: saving the world from a nuclear catastrophe. What is more, these proposals have been coming from the Soviet Union and also from other participants in the Warsaw Pact. In particular, for instance, the proposal of the GDR and the CSSR paves the way to a nuclear-free Europe. The chief thing is that the joint document adopted in Berlin on the Warsaw Pact's military doctrine is indeed a direct challenge to NATO to seek the principles of an equal balance of forces at the lowest possible level needed to ensure defense.

If the North Atlantic bloc were to agree to this, you can imagine how far and how much faster the cause of disarmament would advance. However, the first reaction from official spokesmen of the NATO Headquarters in Brussels do not as yet cause one to be particularly optimistic. For instance, the NATO spokesmen have welcomed the idea of talks on conventional armaments but are not actually agreeing, or at least have not yet agreed, to the Warsaw Pact proposal that joint consultations be held on military strategy.

How can this be understood? Well, it is evident the NATO leaders, who have constantly been trying to convince us and the whole world that their alliance is purely defensive, now when it has become a matter of concrete deeds, have either lost their heads or are indeed not ready to give practical evidence on NATO's defensive character. The well-known U.S. journalist Flora Lewis forthrightly points out that NATO's hesitating on this issue because it is unable to draw up a concerted plan on how to set about the lowering of the levels of armaments.

The reaction of NATO's uppercrust to the proposal that there be a mutual reduction in arms expenditures and that a moratorium be imposed on expenditures for 1-2 years can also be appraised in this way. Although there has been no official response, the newspapers, citing Western diplomatic sources, are saying NATO regards this proposal as propaganda, it is claimed.

Perhaps it might be better to check this in practice. After all, you see what happens when both sides display an interest. It is precisely on this account that, to judge by everything, the realistic and even to hear that the prospect has appeared for reducing nuclear missile weaponry in Europe. If the defensive character of military doctrines gains the upper hand, the world will certainly become far more secure. It is precisely for this that the participants in the Berlin meeting are calling.

NATO, WARSAW PACT CALL FOR 'OPPOSITE' RESPONSES

LD312222 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 31 May 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; "Telebridge" report under the rubric: "Studio 20," presented by S. Alekseyev. Participating are Moscow television correspondents Yevgeniy Shirokov, in Budapest; Aleksandr Zholkver, in Berlin; Vladimir Kondratyev, in the FRG; and Vsevolod Shishkovskiy, in the UK -- live or recorded]

[Excerpts] "Hello, comrades! This week has turned out to be particularly generous with major, substantial events in international life. The main ones, indisputably, were the official friendly visit to Romania by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and the regular conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the participant states of the Warsaw Pact in Berlin. How do our neighbors on the planet assess their results? How do they match them with the policies of their countries and with their current period? I have asked some of our foreign correspondents to talk to us today". [passage omitted]

[Alekseyev] "Precisely on the day Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev completed his visit to Romania and on the eve of the opening of the conference in Berlin, meetings of the leading bodies of NATO ended in Brussels. In the course of these meetings, as is well known, the military men and politicians of NATO again stated their adherence to the doctrine of military deterrence, an offensive doctrine, and the doctrine of flexible response. They also agreed on new increases in their military budgets and on an increase in the quantity of conventional weapons in Europe, in other words, on the complete opposite of what the participant states of the Warsaw Pact were calling for in Berlin. As is well known, the tone at the Brussels meetings was set, together with the United States, by the Federal Republic of Germany. Has its position changed now? A question for our correspondent in the FRG, Vladimir Kondratyev:

[Kondratyev] The position of the West German military and politicians cannot be examined in isolation from the situation currently taking shape in the FRG on the issue of eliminating medium- and short-range missiles. By all accounts, the Federal Government this week will give its formal agreement to the double-zero solution, which it has so long and stubbornly opposed. Many on the Rhine are unable to conceal their irritation on account of the outcome, unfavorable to them, of the missile discussion. Another propaganda campaign is beginning. Activists in the CDU-CSU are discovering new windows of vulnerability in the event of the implementation of the zero-option, this time in conventional weapons. They juggle with the figures, and it turns out that the overall superiority is 3-1 in favor of the East, and countermeasures have to be taken. They attribute the capacity for invasion to the Soviet Union.

[Alekseyev, interrupting] And this -- sorry -- is while the countries of the Warsaw Pact are offering to begin consultations on our military doctrines and on the allegedly existing imbalance in conventional types of weapons?

[Kondratyev] Yes, at precisely this time the FRG is harping on so-called deterrence. The total liberation of our continent from nuclear weapons is, in general, a nightmare for Bonn. Here they simply cannot renounce the postulate according to which the maintenance of peace in Europe is impossible without the combination of both nuclear and conventional weapons.

[Alekseyev] Well, is there, at least, some concrete reaction from Bonn officialdom to the results of the conference in Berlin?

[Kondratyev] There is a reaction. I would call it positively restrained. On the one hand Bonn would like to confirm her interest in a political dialogue with the Soviet Union. At the same time, voices can be heard that the Warsaw Pact has not offered anything new. They themselves do not put forward any concrete ideas, but act according to the principle: Why hurry? Why rush? Let us wait; perhaps we will be offered something else.

[Alekseyev] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave the apt name: a game of cat and mouse to such attitudes on the part of the NATO countries to the proposal of the Warsaw Pact member states on nuclear disarmament and consolidating peace and security in Europe. To what extent do they share this thought in Britain? Question for Vsevolod Shishkovskiy:

[Shishkovskiy] I have to say there still remain unclear patches in the policies of London, too. Officially, the British Government has stated that it supports the double-zero option, which provides for the elimination of medium-range and operational and tactical missiles in Europe. However, this statement was bound up with a whole series of provisos, that the elimination of these types of nuclear weapons must not lead to a weakening of the security of the West or to a renunciation of the notorious NATO strategy of flexible response. There can be no doubt that the results of the Berlin meeting which have stimulated great interest here in Great Britain and will exert a certain influence on the course of the pre-election campaign in Great Britain. At the same time, this course is showing the reluctance of Thatcher's party to renounce old stereotypes. This was confirmed by the discussion on issues of defense, which has gotten under way literally in the last few days. The Conservatives have made a direct attack on the policy of a non-nuclear Britain proclaimed in the Labour manifesto.

[Alekseyev] While our telebridge has been going on today, a report has been brought to me in the studio from the teletype, which, I think, can sum up our meeting today. A correspondent of the British news agency REUTER writes: Now, after Berlin, the West has so many concrete proposals from the Soviet Union and the socialist countries that it is simply impossible, simply shameful, not to give a reasonable reply to them. It is really difficult to add anything to this. All the best.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA ON MEDIUM-RANGE MISSILES ISSUE

PM251221 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 May 87 First Edition p 3

["Military-Political Review" by Lieutenant Colonel V. Nikanorov: "The Peoples Expect an Answer"]

[Text] Any choice is agonizing. That is an approximate translation of the old German saying which bears witness to how complicated it is to chose one out of numerous possible options. Recent events prove that this saying is entirely applicable to international affairs, to the solution of the Euromissiles problem, for instance. True, there are not that many serious options to choose from. Nonetheless, for the umpteenth month now NATO circles have been agonizing over what to decide: to give a positive reply to the Soviet proposal to eliminate U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe and thus effect a real breakthrough in the field of nuclear disarmament, or to retain their loyalty to their old militarist course which is in fact leading to nuclear catastrophe.

Life itself has faced the West with the need to make this choice. The West cannot ignore the Soviet initiatives which have met with such widespread approval among the peoples. But so far the NATO states are still not ready for a resolute step toward a nuclear-free world. Some governments in West Europe still have not decided for themselves how to treat the prospect of the elimination of U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles on the continent.

Differences in the NATO camp on this very important current issue were graphically manifested during the session of the bloc's Nuclear Planning Group in the Norwegian town of Stavanger. The session failed to come up with a unified approach on the part of the allies toward the Euromissiles problem. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has already written about this. Nor was there any unanimity on this question at the NATO Assembly's spring session. This session of the NATO parliamentary organ was held in the Canadian city of Quebec. It is expected that the final answer to the Soviet peace initiatives will be elaborated at the NATO Council session scheduled for June. As is well known, it will be held in Reykjavik -- in the Icelandic capital where the Soviet-U.S. accords were born which aroused in the peoples of the world hopes for the planet's liberation from the nuclear threat. The immediate future will show whether these hopes are justified and whether the Atlanticists will be able to renounce the old stereotypes and make the correct choice.

There are influential forces in the West which are not interested in Europe's liberation from nuclear arsenals. They are the ones trying to do everything to drag out and halt the solution of the Euromissiles problem, trying to create an endless pernicious chain of ever new "strings." You only have to recall the activeness of the representatives of the extreme right-wing faction of the West German conservative Christian Democratic Union/Christian Socialist Union [CDU/CSU]. FRG Defense Minister M. Woerner, A. Dregger, chairman of the CDU/CSU Bundestag faction, and those who think like them are openly militating for the withdrawal of medium-range missiles from Europe to be "compensated" by new operational-tactical missiles. There are also people like this in other Western states on both sides of the ocean. They are the ones who first said that the question of medium-range missiles cannot be resolved without the simultaneous elimination of operational-tactical missiles and then began also to include tactical nuclear weapons, battlefield nuclear weapons, and then conventional armaments and armed forces. The Soviet Union and its allies are prepared to resolve all these serious questions. But these problems cannot be used for all kinds of delays. This idea is shared by many Western politicians. "It seems somewhat surprising to me," Norwegian Defense Minister J. Holst noted, "that when an agreement is becoming a real possibility some people are trying to avoid it."

The press assessed the recent statement by the FRG federal chancellor, who proposed holding talks on nuclear weapons with a range of "0-1,000 km" linking them with the talks on conventional and chemical weapons, as a desire to reject the "zero-zero option." The chancellor's statement fails to stipulate the date or form of these talks and lacks any tie-in with the corresponding proposals from the Warsaw Pact states. "You do not need to have any malicious intention," the newspaper UNSERE ZEIT wrote on the subject, "to see in H. Kohl's statement the desire...to complicate the talks so that their failure can be preprogrammed."

It should be noted that Bonn's unconstructive position on nuclear disarmament questions was the reason for the grave defeat suffered last Sunday by the FRG ruling parties at the elections to the Rheinland-Pfalz Landtag and the Hamburg city assembly of deputies. "The party's stance on disarmament issues caused the principal damage to the CDU," STUTTGARTER ZEITUNG wrote. "Many voters were unable to comprehend how the 'zero option' previously presented as an ideal had suddenly ceased to be the aim of the FRG Government's policy."

es of Europe do not want to live under the protection of U.S. nuclear An increasing number of people realize that the presence of the Pershing-2 missiles in West Europe in no way enhances security here.

s into account, the champions of the arms race are doing everything to retain cence and at the same time acquire militarist capital, so to speak. As THE POST has noted. the NATO countries' defense ministers who gathered in while welcoming the "improvement in the prospects" of a U.S.-Soviet on eliminating medium-range nuclear missiles, at the same time confirmed ntion to modernize nuclear weapons in Europe. According to press reports, is preparing plans for the so-called "compensation" of the planned reduction r armaments in Europe. The British newspaper NEWS ON SUNDAY has assessed ns as "a swindle." The Pentagon and NATO, the newspaper attests, intend in r not to eliminate medium-range nuclear missile weapons stationed on British but merely to remove them from ground-based launchers and station them on bombers and submarines. In addition it is planned to "transfer" these to a different category and thus remove them from the framework of an on medium-range missiles.

, what will happen if the Soviet Union agrees to this idea during the talks on nge missiles? In that case, NEWS ON SUNDAY writes, all 96 cruise missiles at the Greenham Common base will be dismantled and plans to place a further missiles at the Molesworth base will be cancelled. But instead the U.S. stationed at the U.S. Air Force base in Fairford will, according to the , be equipped with at least 230 cruise missiles. A further 108 of these will be taken on by submarines based at Holy Loch. As a result of this tion" the number of cruise missiles stationed in Britain could be trebled. the ploy that the missile champions intend to put into action, considering, futilely, that the Soviet Union will agree to lesser security for itself and s.

efense Secretary G. Younger has admitted the possibility that Britain might w nuclear weapons on its territory to help NATO "to compensate for the ance of U.S. cruise missiles at Greenham Common and other intermediate-range from Europe as a result of an arms control agreement with Moscow." The ty of Britain becoming a base for submarines equipped with cruise missiles, he gured in all lists of potential measures" to eliminate any gaps forming in the lear deterrent" forces as a result of the loss of the ground-based cruise and Pershing 2 missiles. According to THE FINANCIAL TIMES this was the t's first public recognition of the fact that "an agreement between the rs on missiles in Europe could simply alter the nature of nuclear weapons in nd continental Europe and fail to lead to substantial reductions of these

the sound of peace-loving rhetoric, everything is being done to prevent a fair on medium-range missiles in Europe -- an agreement which encroaches on no urity. After all, the aim of this agreement is to lower the level of nuclear m on the continent, to reduce the threat of a nuclear flare-up. Will the t of this goal be promoted by the "political agreement" which, according to aper THE TIMES, has been reached between the United States, Britain, and the e issue of the placement of "a new stratum of nuclear weapons in Europe" if an on arms reduction is concluded? The answer is obvious.

dering the "new stratum," the Pentagon is not ceasing its dangerous ions with its "old" stratum. [paragraph continues]

It is hard to assess as anything other than a challenge to the world public the "carbon blazer" military maneuvers which recently ended in West Germany's Baden-Wuerttemburg and in which 72 U.S. Pershing-2 nuclear missiles took part. And what is the worth of the routine simultaneous launches of six such missiles in the United States recently? All this attests that the Pentagon intends in actual fact to keep these missiles in Europe, perhaps merely converting them to Pershing-1B missiles. Let us recall that the reverse operation, according to specialists' assessments, takes just 48 hours.

The U.S. weekly TIME magazine has reported that active work is now under way in the United States to create the "third generation" of nuclear weapons adapted for use in space. One feature of these weapons is the relatively small yield of their charges and the possibility of a "guided" nuclear explosion. Thus, the magazine writes, it will be possible 'to strike specific targets without destroying an entire city...." If these weapons are supplied to militarists, the West Berlin newspaper WAHRHEIT notes, it would mean the continuation of the arms race.

The path to a secure world does not lie through the creation of ever new types of weapons, nor through an endless chain of "strings." We cannot allow mankind to take one step after another to the borderline beyond which is nothingness. Life demands that we agree to begin moving in the opposite direction. As M.S. Gorbachev stressed in his replies to the questions of the UNITA editorial office, this is now a categorical imperative of politics and diplomacy.

In this spirit, the USSR and the other socialist community countries shape their policy. The Soviet Union has put forward specific proposals which ensure the necessary conditions for elaborating mutually acceptable solutions for the entire complex of questions of nuclear and space armaments. Implementation of the proposals by the Warsaw Pact states in Budapest would be a major step on the path to creating a world safe for all. Implementation of the joint proposal of the GDR and the CSSR on the creation of a nuclear-free corridor in central Europe and the adoption of the Jaruzelski plan and many other constructive initiatives put forward by the socialist countries could be notable milestones on this path. It is now up to the West. Whether the pernicious chain fettering the solution of the problem of the ending of the arms race and of disarmament is broken depends on it. We cannot allow the historical chance now available for moving to a real reduction of nuclear armaments to be let slip. Political realism must prevail.

INTERNATIONAL PHYSICIANS CONGRESS MEETS IN MOSCOW

Gorbachev Sends Greetings

LD291210 Moscow TASS in English 1136 GMT 29 May 87

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS -- Follows the full text of the message of greetings by Mikhail Gorbachev general secretary of the CPSU CC, to the participants of the 7th World Congress of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War [IPPNW]:

"I wholeheartedly greet the 7th World Congress of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War which has gathered in Moscow.

I regard the emergence and remarkable development of your movement and its universal prestige as yet another good and impressive sign that peace has staunch and convinced supporters and their number is multiplying.

Mankind has no right to lull itself with illusions. It should know the truth about the ruinous consequences of nuclear war for all living things. The truth is bitter but it is also a potent medicine for indifference, apathy, and passivity when it is a matter of saving life on earth.

The bell of your movement is now heard throughout the world. It impels one to act. You honestly say that medicine would be powerless to help people in the chaos of nuclear conflagration. This is really so.

You justly regard as immoral the banking on 'nuclear deterrence' which is permanently fraught with a tremendous danger of an irremediable malfunction. Besides, the arms race swallows resources the utilisation of which for the needs of health care and science would make it possible to stamp out many grave diseases and to improve the health of individuals and mankind as a whole and, I will add, to get rid of many social ills which are known not only to the developing countries but to the developed ones as well.

Your thoughts and ideas of how to preserve civilisation and to cure 'nuclear madness' are understandable to us. We share them. They aroused a broad response at the Moscow forum 'For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity'.

Our country comes out in favour of eliminating nuclear arms. At any moment the Soviet Union is ready to resume the moratorium on nuclear tests and to ban them altogether if the United States and other nuclear powers follow suit.

Peace built on nuclear deterrence is fragile and dangerous. To try to reliably strengthen it through ever new build-ups of arms, ground- or space-based ones, means to go in the direction opposite to the interests of peace.

The present-day situation is a historical challenge to political leaders and to every person. It reminds one of responsibility. We consider it necessary to move on from competition in stockpiling the arsenals of destruction to cooperation in radically reducing them. The Soviet Union is prepared to go its part of the road in good faith. Even though our state has nuclear arms, it will never be the first to use them.

The USSR solemnly states that it is prepared to give them up completely by the year 2000 or earlier, on the basis of reciprocity, of course, and under the most stringent international control.

We are convinced that the first steps towards nuclear disarmament can and should be made without delay. They will serve well the interests of universal security and will add so urgently needed elements of trust to our troubled and interdependent world.

Ideological differences, and political ones, too, should not obstruct our view of the common destinies of mankind and of the priority of life and universal human values. The current period requires bold and urgent actions by all people concerned for the future of civilisation.

I am confident that at this turning point of mankind's history the voice of physicians will continue to sound loudly and authoritatively. Your goals are lofty and humane. I wish you success. I wish the Moscow congress success in its work for the good of universal peace.

[signed] Mikhail Gorbachev

1st Day Activities

PM021109 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 May 87 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Formula for Saving the World. The Seventh International Congress of 'International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War' Has Opened in Moscow"]

[Text] Freeing the world of nuclear weapons is a really feasible aim. It is with total confidence that reason will gain the upper hand over folly and that the "epidemic to end all epidemics" will not break out on earth that the participants in the Seventh International Congress of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" movement have gathered in Moscow. This forum, involving more than 2,000 representatives of 55 countries, opened on 29 May at the "Druzhba" concert and sports complex in Luzhniki Park.

The congress was opened by M.I. Kuzin, cochairman of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" movement, director of the A.V. Vishnevskiy Institute of Surgery, and academician of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences. He quoted the words of Albert Einstein: "We need new criteria of thought if mankind wants to survive," which have been chosen as the motto of the Moscow forum of doctors, and as chairman of the congress organization committee, he expressed satisfaction with the enormous interest shown by the world medical community in the Moscow meeting. Not only doctors and medical scientists are involved in the program, but also eminent political, religious, and social figures, scientists, writers, and journalists.

The congress delegates and guests paid great attention to the message of greetings addressed to the forum of doctors from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The message was read by A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Then J. Pastore (United States), secretary of the movement's executive committee, read out the numerous greetings messages sent to the congress. [paragraph continues]

Wishes for success were sent to the Moscow forum delegates by the UN secretary general, the heads of a number of other international organizations, and by many heads of state and government from all five continents.

The convening of the Moscow congress of doctors has coincided with an important anniversary in medical history. This year mankind celebrates the 10th anniversary of one of the greatest victories -- a victory won not on the battlefield but in the laboratories, clinics, and field expeditions of doctors the world over, who, through joint effort, succeeded in removing smallpox from our planet. R. Rugunda, Ugandan minister of health, dedicated his report to this remarkable success by the doctors of the world. In the same way, through joint effort, he stressed, we can also resolve the main problem of today -- the problem of saving mankind and preserving civilization. Everyone in the world, irrespective of their nationality, religion, or political views, must have the fundamental right to life and health.

Academician Ye.I. Chazov, USSR minister of health, presented a report entitled "The Destruction of Nuclear Weapons -- The Aim of the Physicians' Movement." The congress audience, he said, does not only consist of the approximately 3,000 delegates present here, but also includes the more than 1 million Soviet doctors who share the humanitarian aims of your movement.

It must be pointed out to the credit of the world's doctors, the speaker continued, that they were the first to not only demonstrate on the basis of accurate scientific data all the tragic consequences of a nuclear war, this "epidemic to end all epidemics," but also to offer their own prescription to save the world. It is logical that responsible statesmen always listen to what the public and scientists have to say. How great then was our amazement when the representatives of a number of governments said at the World Assembly of the WHO -- an organization intended to protect the life and health of people throughout the world -- that discussion of the consequences of the nuclear arms race and nuclear war for mankind is not within the competence of this organization and only "politicizes" its activity. I would have liked these gentlemen to have been with us by the beds of the 28 patients who died from radiation sickness as a result of the accident at the Chernobyl AES. The thought that millions of people all over the world could die in the same way is terrible even to us, doctors who come into contact with death every day.

Yes, we doctors have our own policy, Academician Chazov said, and not only are we proud of this, we also strive to make this policy widespread, because it is aimed at guaranteeing the life and health of our peoples and their well-being. We live and work for the sake of this policy. We will not argue with those who claim that peace can only be maintained on the basis of "nuclear deterrence." We will merely stress that the mechanism of nuclear deterrence is not infallible. It is no longer possible to win the arms race, just as it is impossible to win a nuclear war. The main choice in the world today is not between states belonging to different social systems, but between death and survival.

The innovative and comprehensive plan for nuclear disarmament by the 21st century proposed by the Soviet Union, the speaker went on to emphasize, has opened up real prospects for freeing mankind of the threat of self-destruction. What does the world need today to ensure that nuclear arms are eliminated? New thinking, first and foremost. This new thinking is a recognition of the interdependence of all countries in the world today and recognition of the fact that the security of some states cannot be ensured at the expense of others' security. The new thinking encompasses plans to end nuclear weapon tests as soon as possible and plans to eliminate nuclear and other means of mass destruction.

Important elements of creating an atmosphere of trust in our world are restructuring and openness, which determine the essence of the changes taking place in our country. These ambitious tasks can only be carried out in conditions of peace. That is why the Soviet Union's foreign policy and its proposals to strengthen international security, the USSR minister of health stressed, are linked with its domestic policy to an unprecedented degree. We all believe that our dream of a nuclear-free world is realistic. It can only be realized, however, if we doctors convince our peoples of this.

An important condition of peace on earth is the creation of an atmosphere of trust between peoples, countries, and governments. Only then can we jointly resolve the most urgent problems concerning the development of civilization. At the most recent session of the WHO World Assembly, the speaker said, the Soviet Union proposed that all countries of the world combine their efforts in the fight against a danger that is new to us -- AIDS -- and make a voluntary contribution toward the organization of this work. We also proposed that a group of experts be set up to study the possibilities of the peaceful use of space for medical purposes. We do not propose the creation of weapons, but peaceful cooperation in space, a "medical SDI," in the name of the health of mankind. Our slogan is disarmament for development.

We have gathered in Moscow to reach a deeper level of mutual understanding and to outline the new directions of our activity, B. Lown (United States), cochairman of the movement and professor of cardiology at Harvard University, noted. The international movement "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" is in favor of the total elimination of nuclear arms, he said. People in our profession have sworn an oath to destroy all agents capable of wiping out mankind on a massive scale, be it cholera, AIDS, or nuclear arms. As far as we are concerned, their eradication is a categorical imperative from both a medical and a moral standpoint. It is impossible to imagine the kind of circumstances which could justify the use of genocidal weapons.

We must use our energy to convey the idea of eliminating nuclear weapons to everyone. An important role has been played by the Soviet nuclear test moratorium, which lasted for 18 months. This was a far-sighted, historic action which demonstrated the practicability of independent unilateral initiatives and underlined the urgent need for action rather than high-flown words.

Describing the program of action of the international doctors' movement, which is to be discussed at the congress, the speaker highlighted the main tasks. He said:

First, we will continue our efforts to persuade the world public of the need to completely stop all nuclear explosions.

Second, we must continue to agitate against the spread of the nuclear arms race on earth and in space.

Third, we must even more energetically fulfill our mission, namely, to persuade people that the deteriorating standard of living in the world is organically linked with the arms race. Development and disarmament are, without doubt, indissolubly connected.

Fourth, we will promote more civilized diplomacy to counterbalance oversimplified, faceless, dangerous stereotypes.

Fifth, we will broaden the range of our tasks to encourage creative measures conducive to cooperation between doctors on earth and in space.

Doctors are primarily advisers, B. Lown emphasized. To achieve success, we must educate our patients and all who can hear us. We must teach them that in a nuclear world there is either security for everyone or no security at all. People in the East and West must realize that they are not adversaries, but that their real enemy is the mushroom cloud.

Democratic Senator A. Gore (United States) greeted the congress participants. Your movement, he said, makes a considerable contribution to the achievement of a very great aim, the prevention of nuclear war, by reminding us of its monstrous consequences. Yours is a mission essential to mankind, because in our time of peace, war is often transformed into an abstract concept in people's minds.

The prevention of war must become our general strategy, A. Gore stressed. We must all seriously address the problem of mutual fears and mistrust and ensure that every child, whether he is born in the United States, the Soviet Union, or some other corner of the world, has what he deserves -- a secure future.

There then followed the ceremony of presenting awards from the international physicians' movement. D.A. Henderson (United States), V.M. Zhdanov (USSR), M.I.D. Sharma (India), F.K. Karuga (Kenya), and Z.S. de Cuadrosa (Brazil) [names as published] received diplomas for their active participation in the fight against smallpox on earth.

An honorary award was presented to A. Hammer, an eminent representative of U.S. business circles and prominent figure, for his contribution to improving the international situation. Accepting the award, he said that he has always admired the outstanding achievements of the physicians' movement, which appeals to man's conscience and inspires the hope that we will find a way to be rid of the nuclear nightmare. It is quite natural that the fraternity of doctors is leading the attack on the nuclear monster. The only possibility of winning a nuclear war is to prevent it from breaking out at all.

Gorbachev Meets Delegates

PM031101 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 87 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev Meeting With Representatives of the Physicians Movement"]

[Text] On 2 June, M.S. Gorbachev met a group of leading delegates to the Seventh International Congress of Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

Welcoming them, he described the congress as another major step in the development of that influential movement. You appear not only as physicians.

You already have accumulated much experience of introducing your ideas into big politics. Over a short period of time, the initiative of several persons has turned into a movement with the participation of more than 150,000 competent people from many countries. Your voice is heeded and reckoned with, because you do not dissipate your energies in conflicting directions, but concentrate on this decisive direction. This has enabled you to warn humanity about the main danger. Hence the prestige of the movement to which, as this congress has witnessed, trade unions, representatives of other professions and prominent public figures are being drawn and who wish to make their own contribution. It is noteworthy that it was attended by representatives of the developing world.

On behalf of the Soviet Government, Mikhail Gorbachev welcomed those present, and through them the whole movement, wishing it every success: We share the aims of the movement and take them into consideration in our policy. We have a common responsibility to bear to mankind.

Mikhail Gorbachev shared the ideas and plans underlying the Soviet Union's current foreign policy.

The task of survival, he said, is rising over all the differences, disputes and disagreements between states, the social movements, the interests of various groups of people. This conclusion underlies the new mode of political thinking.

The world has changed fundamentally over the recent decades. It is confronted with unprecedented problems: the nuclear threat, an ecological crisis, the revolution in science and technology and its social aftermath, and the new role of the mass communication and information media. They concern all. This is a source of the growth of concern and public activeness all over the world.

This tendency of participation in deciding the destiny of their countries and the world as a whole will powerfully increase since the world is interrelated in all of its parts. The fact that various states have different social systems does not cancel that interrelation.

The USSR and the United States, the socialist states of Europe and Asia, Britain and the FRG, India and Australia, Pakistan and Tanzania, Argentina and Mexico, the Arab states, every nation has its own interests. It is necessary to understand this reality. It is necessary to learn to live in a real world. There is no other way around it. Refusing to recognize that is denying the peoples the right to a free choice. Even if a people is in error, it must itself find a way out. And no one, no "superpower" has the right to interfere in that. It does not come easily now to build the policy on diktat, and it should disappear completely in the course of years.

This realization is making headway with difficulty. But this process has already started and involves even the military circles.

The Soviet Union builds its policy on the basis of a new mode of thinking.

Mikhail Gorbachev reminded those present about the major initiatives and actions undertaken by the Soviet leadership over the past 2 years for lessening international tensions and building up an atmosphere of trust, lessening the nuclear danger, eliminating the chemical weapons, ensuring a cut in conventional weapons and armed forces, giving the military doctrines a solely defense character.

Is the West's reaction adequate? No, it is not. They are speculating there whether this is a sign of the USSR's weakness. Maybe this is because it cannot keep up with the race and it is worthwhile to step it up? they reason. We do not meet with the impulses of real policy in response to our impulses, or are simply faced with politicking.

The present moment is very important. It is hard to say when another such chance might appear. A dangerous tendency created by the "war party" can be altered, the spread of the arms race to space can be prevented. [paragraph continues]

It is true that outer space must become another area of rapprochement and mutual asistance, and not a source of new menace for people.

The ideology of "nuclear deterrence" on which NATO policy is based should be overcome. We have seriously analyzed all aspects of this "theory"; its advocates, apparently, have learned nothing either from Hiroshima, or from Chernobyl, whose lessons now are being forgotten. This apparently, suits certain persons. But we know what it is like.

Nuclear weapons are being upheld, and everything is being done to upgrade them. The programs for their use that are being drawn up specify the stage of war at which the particular kinds of weapons should be used against specific targets, the scope of their use and so on and so forth. It is to condition people to the idea that this is a natural thing, that it is necessary for security. In reality, the concept of "nuclear deterrence" is a false, dangerous, and deeply amoral position.

Answering numerous questions of interlocutors about nuclear weapon tests, Mikhail Gorbachev said that the USSR is prepared to announce a moratorium together with the United States even tomorrow. He agreed with Professor Lown that it is sought to shroud the problem of tests in the midst of talk about verification [kontrol].

The United States has not taken a single step to meet us halfway on the question of tests. Being realists, we agreed to advance bit by bit and proposed in Geneva a draft of a stage-by-stage advance toward full-scale talks on a test ban. But the immediate announcement of a bilateral moratorium could be an initial step. Why shouldn't the U.S. Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet adopt a law restricting the size of the tests to 1 kiloton and reducing their number to the minimum?

But we have a feeling that the U.S. Administration is creating a vicious circle: It is blocking strategic nuclear arms reduction, and links an end to testing with progress in strategic nuclear arms reduction. We again come up against the wish to preserve nuclear arms, cost what it may, even though this contradicts what we had agreed upon with the President and Geneva in Reykjavik.

Mikhail Gorbachev described those forces capable of compelling the governments to advance toward a world without nuclear arms, and expressed confidence that this aim is realistic. He assured the interlocutors that the Soviet Union will continue acting vigorously, that it will not let slip a single chance and moreover, will be acting in such a way that other chances should appear. But this will, naturally, be done on the basis of equal security.

We have vast reserves of goodwill. This is shown also by our proposals on medium-range missiles. Nothing has been done for decades to reduce nuclear arms, and this would be a real step toward starting the process of nuclear disarmament, would have vast practical, political and psychological importance.

Mikhail Gorbachev supported one of the important trends on which the physicians movement works; namely, the explanation of the relationship of disarmament with development, of the arms race with crying economic needs, and not only in developing countries, but in industrialized states, with problems of poverty, health services, education -- wherever the Moloch of militarism takes away huge funds from millions of people. Those who make money on the arms race presenting this as "concern" for national security should be exposed.

Professor Lown spoke during the conversation more than once. So did most of the participants in the meeting. They shared the impressions about the congress which just ended. They noted its specific features: it was the most representative, had the greatest number of delegates so far and it was marked by high intellectual intensity, the depth of the analysis of problems and unprecedented enthusiasism, breadth of contacts, substantive and business-like character of debates, the atmosphere of high responsibility, openness, honesty and clarity of positions. The participants in the meeting linked all this with the atmosphere of greater openness and of the reorganization in the country which was the venue of the congress.

Mikhail Gorbachev strongly supported the idea expressed by Professor Lown that if the whole world debated the problems of survival as honestly, openly and deeply as this was done at the Moscow congress of physicians, these problems could be resolved promptly.

The final document of the seventh congress was presented to Mikhail Gorbachev. Expressing gratitude for interesting ideas advanced at the congress and in the conversation -- which will be taken into consideration in Soviet policy -- for confidence and for wishes of successes to the Soviet people who took the road of profound change, Mikhail Gorbachev spoke highly of the activity of physicians at this responsible and crucial time.

Taking part in the meeting were Professor Bernard Lown, U.S. cochairman of the movement, and Louisa Lown; one of the founders of the international physicians movement Academician Yevgeniy Chazov, USSR health minister; Academician of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences Mikhail Kuzin, the Soviet cochairman of the movement, director of the Vishnevskiy Institute of Surgery; vice presidents of the movement: Professor Lars Engstedt (Sweden), Ian Maddocks (Australia), Dr. Donald Bates (Canada), Academician Susan Hollan (Hungary), Dr. Rene Bresquet (Argentina); secretary of the executive committee of the movement Dr. John Pastore (U.S); executive director of the movement C. Nugent (U.S.); president of the U.S. organization "Physicians for Social Responsibility" Viktor Sidel; Professor Ulrich Gottstein (FRG); academicians of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences: Leonid Ilin, director of the Institute of Biophysics, and Nikolay Bochkov, director of the Institute of Genetics.

Aleksandr Yakovlev and Anatoliy Dobrynin took part in the meeting.

IZVESTIYA on Talks, U.S. Role

PM021301 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jun 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by special correspondents B. Ivanov and V. Mikheyev: "A Prescription for Mankind's Survival"]

[Text] The seventh congress of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" (IPPNW) movement has ended.

...On the previous day the small conference hall on the second floor of the International Trade Center had been packed to capacity. Those who had been unable to find a seat were sitting on the floor or standing in the gangways. A verbal duel had developed between U.S. Ambassador to Moscow J. Matlock and congress guest Robert Bowman. Note that it was the first time an official representative of the U.S. Administration had participated in an IPPNW congress.

In his speech, which could easily be described as an "Ode to SDI," the U.S. ambassador tried to present the "star wars" program as a panacea promising military security for the United States and apparently safeguarding world peace. His words did not produce a lively response from the audience. It was his opponent who gained the applause.

R. Bowman demonstrated in an emotional and cogent speech that SDI is above all an attempt to safeguard one's own security using weapons and military equipment. And this has never led to disarmament and peace. SDI is an attempt to find a method of waging and winning a nuclear war and of guaranteeing one's own security to the detriment of the other side's security. But in our day, one-sided security is impossible. Our two powers can only survive or perish together.

R. Bowman has behind him 22 years' service in the U.S. Air Force, the Vietnam war (where he flew 101 combat missions), and work in the Pentagon under the G. Ford and J. Carter administrations, where he was in charge of the program for creating types of space weapons -- the prototype of the present SDI. He is now president of the Institute for the Study of Security and Space Issues and author of the book "Star Wars: Stars of Defense or Death" ["Star Wars: A Defense Insider's Case Against the Startegic Defense Initiative"].

"It may seem strange that a man with my career history has become an active opponent of the program I was once actually in charge of," R. Bowman said in an interview with IZVESTIYA correspondents. "But in our country many servicemen believe that the nuclear danger can be avoided only by presenting war. When I realized this, I immediately became an opponent of SDI. I believe that all types of space weapons must be banned. We must not waste time making groundless accusations against one another -- who has overtaken whom in the arms race -- but work together to create an atmosphere of trust and friendship and peaceful cooperation in the world."

"What We Believe In" is what the physicians have called their appeal. It is a knot of pain and anxiety for the future of civilization which is threatened by a nuclear sword of Damocles. It is not a weapon, the physicians tell us, since it deals death even to those who wield it and use it first. It is an instrument of genocide. The total destructive power of the mountains of nuclear weapons accumulated in the world exceeds the lethal potential of 6,000 wars of the scale of World War II. There are now around 4 metric tons of explosive for every inhabitant of earth. Entire nations and states have become nuclear captives and involuntary hostages.

Involuntary? Some claim that these monstrous weapons are a guarantee of international stability and a token of peace. No, say the scientists who have sworn the Hippocratic oath. They burden human relations with fear and the yoke of distrust, keep civilization in a state of constant mobilization, and have turned it into a seething armed camp. What is to be done? The prescription offered by the physicians' movement calls for the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

In their appeal "What We Believe In," they refer to themselves as "abolitionists." This is used to mean supporters of the elimination of slavery in the United States. The physicians want to release people from enslavement to the nuclear arms race and to wrench the world out of a vicious circle.

Their recommendation is that any interim measures which slow down militarization and contribute to increase trust are of benefit. It is extremely important to have a mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions, which would prevent the creation of new destabilizing types of weapons. [paragraph continues]

The physicians state in their document: "We are opposed to any strategic program, on earth or in space, even one that is claimed to be defensive, the logical consequence of which would be the additional deployment of nuclear weapons." These words are an indictment of the SDI program.

A physician knows better than anyone else the true cost of military appropriations -- according to UN data, expenditure on 1 soldier in Africa, for example, is equivalent to the cost of education, medical treatment, and social security for 364 civilians. The victory over smallpox was achieved at a cost equal to... 3 hours of the endless arms race in the world. Therefore, the physicians at the Moscow forum have plainly stated: "We believe that a joint victory by the East and West over nuclear weapons would help strengthen trust and common sense, which are essential to stop the planet's bleeding and heal the wound through which more than $2 billion are being lost daily."

These facts must be made available to all, be made public. "Every physician is also a teacher. We must explain to our patients and to the whole of mankind that today security can only be collective," U.S. cardiologist Bernard Lown, cochairman of the IPPNW, said in his speech.

In the breaks between sessions and meetings, we talked with participants and guests of the congress.

"The physicians' words are being heeded not only by their patients; everyone who is alarmed by the nuclear snydrome that is affecting both industrial and developing states is seeking a cure for the disease. Our movement is offering a prescription that can be understood. The funds released from the mortal grip of the arms race could be used for the struggle against famine and epidemics," Richard Muigay [name as published], a researcher in the area of treating tropical diseases in Kenya, told us.

"We decided to hold our annual meeting in Moscow because we believe that Moscow is going in the right direction in the foreign policy sphere," Sidney Alexander, director of the cardiological center at the Lakhi [as published] medical center and former president of the "Physicians for Social Responsibility" organization (a membership of around 40,000 U.S. doctors), said. "We would like to see positive reciprocal actions by the U.S. Administration, both in terms of concluding arms control agreements and with regard to broad international cooperation. The Union of Concerned Physicians lives and is in operation for these noble purposes."

The solidarity of physicians united against the "traumatic epidemic," as the USSR surgeon N.I. Pirogov described war, is based on an obvious fact: Disease is easier to prevent than to cure. Especially as there is no treatment for the nuclear disease. There are only preventive measures.

People of different political opinions, religious views, and nationalities are united by one idea. It has enabled them to rise above the differences and feel they are of the same race -- the human race. When Socrates was asked what nationality he was, the Greek philosopher did not call himself an Athenian, but replied: "I am a citizen of the world." His home was the whole world.

The skies above our common home must be peaceful. It is to this noble goal that the representatives of the most human progress are devoting their experience, knowledge, and energy in offering their prescription for mankind's survival.

REAGAN DEPARTS FOR 'BIG SEVEN' MEETING IN ITALY

LD031817 Moscow TASS in English 1756 GMT 3 Jun 87

[Text] Washington June 3 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko:

President Reagan left for Italy today to attend an economic summit of seven leading capitalist countries, the United States, Britain, West Germany, Japan, Italy, Canada and France, to be held in Venice on June 8-10.

Before the "big seven" meet, Ronald Reagan will visit Rome and the Vatican for talks with the Italian leaders and Pope John Paul II.

On the completion of the Venice summit, Reagan will pay brief visits to West Berlin and Bonn.

The summit will deal with numerous issues related to the economic and financial situation in the Western world, according to official reports.

It is indicated that trade and financial contradictions between these countries will be high on the agenda.

Reagan made it clear before departure that he would press the U.S. partners to give American commodities and capital broader access to their markets. This related, primarily, to Japan. The U.S. has the biggest deficit in trading with that country.

The local press inquired whether specific and effective measures would be adopted in Venice to improve the economic situation of the West's leading nations.

The U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT forecast that no one expected the Venice meeting to lead to progress or become a turning point.

The American Administration announced that the U.S. would raise the issue of the Persian Gulf situation.

It bluntly declared that the U.S. would insist that the allies join the American naval operations in the Gulf. But according to reports from the Western European capitals, the American allies will hardly meet Washington's demands on this matter.

The only thing which observers discuss with certainty is that the U.S. would try and impose its will on the allies.

UPI news agency observed that Reagan intented to assert American domination at the international and economic fronts.

Arrival, Predeparture Interview

LD040904 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 4 Jun 87

[Text] President Reagan of the United States arrived in Italy on Wednesday for a summit conference of the seven leading capitalist countries opening in Venice next Monday. It will discuss East-West relations and also economic problems.

On the eve of his departure, President Reagan gave an interview to the ANSA agency. An American-Soviet agreement on medium-range and shorter-range missiles in Europe, he said, would be of historic importance since it would be the first agreement on nuclear arms reductions. At the same time the President made it clear that the United States was in no hurry with the signing of such an agreement.

BUSINESSMAN CITES WHITE HOUSE ROLE IN IRAN ARMS DEAL

LD040846 Moscow TASS in English 0738 GMT 4 Jun 87

[Text] Washington June 4 TASS -- Albert Hakim, an Iranian-American businessman who has begun giving testimony in the special congressional commissions probing the Iran-Contras scandal, said Wednesday that "The President of the United States had personally signed an order authorizing" the operation to sell arms to Iran and divert part of the proceeds to Nicaraguan contras.

Hakim, a partner in a "private venture" funding arms supplies to Iran and the contras, added he had had "substantial official support" in Washington.

"We were dealing with the White House staff," he said. "It never occurred to me as a private citizen independently to investigate the legality of the President's policy".

Hakim said he had also often dealt with the Central Intelligence Agency, the Drug Enforcement Administration and National Security Council staff.

The businessman, who managed a private account in a Swiss bank that was used to finance arms shipments to the contras, did so under the direct guidance of Lieutenant-Colonel Oliver North, a former National Security Council aide.

PAPERS CITE MOTIVES FOR 'INTRUSION' OF U.S. CRUISER

Bragin in PRAVDA

PM031523 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 May 87 Second Edition p 5

["Commentator's Column" by Nikolay Bragin: "Where Is Arkansas?"]

[Text] One of the U.S. states -- Arkansas -- is located "in the boondocks," on the banks of the Missisippi. So you can imagine how far the U.S. Navy nuclear missile cruiser under the same name had strayed. As reported earlier, this Arkansas was discovered in Avacha Bay, near Kamchatka. It had twice violated the USSR border -- 17 and 21 May.

The intrusion into Soviet territorial waters was a provocative action and, unquestionably, a deliberate one. Is it conceivable that all the navigation instruments could have failed on a modern warship? That sort of thing does not happen. So there is plain evidence of a violation of the USSR laws and regulations relating to our territorial waters. [paragraph continues]

.S. Navy command could not have been unaware of these laws and regulations, ally since the Soviet side has issued warnings to Washington in this respect l times before in connection with other instances of the violation of the Soviet rder.

me just to recall the events which occurred 13 March last year in the Black Sea the southern shore of the Crimea. At that time the U.S. Navy command dispatched .S. warships to Soviet shores on a spying mission. The ships violated the USSR border. The Soviet Union resolutely condemned this action and demanded that the side take the measures necessary to rule out similar actions.

er, judging by appearances, Washington did not heed the voice of reason. It seems some people in the United States are not happy at the improvement of the national situation and the maintenance of normal relations between the United s and the Soviet Union and other peace-loving states. And the result is the sion of a U.S. warship into Soviet waters in the area of Avacha Bay.

is a case of yet another example of uncivilized conduct by the United States in national relations. It is not difficult to imagine the potentially dangerous equences with which such demonstrations of "strength," such deliberately ocative "stings" are fraught in the complex times we live in. And people in the ed States cannot be unaware of this when they dispatch their warships to "stray" in ign territorial waters.

is causing concern and indignation among the Soviet public. Could not the lemen in Washington choose somewhere else for their "meanderings"? But this is not It is known that anti-Soviet provocations are staged on land, in the air, or, as at sea every time a hint of a positive shift in either Soviet-American relations disarmament questions emerges. And in this respect the "course" steered by the nsas is an alarming sign.

Mozgovoy in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA

1427 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 May 87 First Edition p 3

Mozgovoy commentary: "Why the 'Arkansas' Intruded Into Soviet Territorial Waters"]

xt] As a USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman reported, on 17 and 21 May the U.S. lear-powered missile cruiser Arkansas violated our country's state border in the a of the Avachinskiy Gulf -- an area of water off Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy.

h actions can only be regarded as premeditated provocation undertaken in obvious lation of the USSR laws and rules regarding Soviet territorial waters. The U.S. and's references to warships' right to peaceful passage through other states' ritorial waters is juridically unfounded. Such a right does indeed exist, but it is ulated by the relevant legislation of the countries whose sovereignty extends to the as of water in question. The peaceful passage of foreign warships through USSR ritorial waters is permitted only in specially authorized regions proclaimed by the iet Government. The Avachinskiy Gulf is not among these regions. And U.S. naval dquarters are well informed of this.

Let us recall that the intrusion by the Arkansas is not the first such incident. On 13 March last year the U.S. missile cruiser Yorktown and the destroyer Caron violated the USSR state border in the Black Sea, off the southern coast of the Crimea. Black Sea Fleet strike forces were immediately ready to put an end to the U.S. Navy ships' provocative maneuvers. But bearing in mind all the gravity of the possible consequences for Soviet-U.S. relations, our sailors showed patience and restraint.

An analogous situation existed off the shores of Kamchatka. Similar provocations had been staged before in this region. Thus during the "Fleetex-83" maneuvers warplanes taking off from the aircraft carriers Enterprise and Midway continually intruded into our country's airspace.

What goals are the organizers of the provocations pursuing? As THE LOS ANGELES TIMES points out, U.S. Navy ships and aircraft have the task of "arousing a reaction from Soviet submarines and reconnaissance aircraft in order to evaluate the Russians' tactics and their potential in such situations." The U.S. command needs this information in order to work out the United States' "new naval strategy," which proclaims that the U.S. Navy must be ready to conduct offensive operations against the USSR in the latter's own territorial waters and to strike against targets deep inside Soviet territory.

The Arkansas raid on the Avachinskiy Gulf has underlying political motives also. As is well known, Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms are actively under way. The very real prospect of concluding an agreement on medium-range missiles has emerged at them. So now some people in the Pentagon and other Washington government departments have decided to complicate Soviet-U.S. relations. Furthermore, Moscow has just stated once again its readiness to resolve the problem of medium-range missiles on a global basis -- that is, to reach agreement with the United States on the elimination of weapons of this class not only in Europe but also on the Asian territory of the USSR and, correspondingly, on U.S. territory. "There would be no obstacles to such a decision," M.S. Gorbachev noted in his speech at a dinner in honor of Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the PCV Central Committee, "if the United States eliminated its nuclear weapons in Japan, South Korea, and the Philippines and withdrew its aircraft carrier flotilla beyond agreed positions." But not only is the Pentagon not withdrawing these flotillas, on the contrary, it is deliberately moving them still closer to Soviet borders.

A resolute protest was lodged with the U.S. Government in connection with the Arkansas sortie. It pointed out that such violations can have the most serious consequences for which responsibility would lie utterly and completely with the United States. The demand was made that the Americans take all necessary measures to preclude similar incidents in the future.

DOBRYNIN HOLDS TALKS WITH USIA DIRECTOR WICK

LD031439 Moscow TASS in English 1421 GMT 3 Jun 87

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS -- Matters concerning the present state as well as prospects for the development of Soviet-U.S. relations, particularly in the sphere of bilateral exchanges between the Soviet Union and the United States were discussed today by Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Charles Wick, director of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA).

Mr Wick has arrived in the Soviet Union for an official visit.

ANATOLIY GROMYKO SEES CHANGING U.S. VIEWS OF USSR

PM031031 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 May 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by Anatoliy A. Gromyko, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "Signs of Change? On How the New Political Thinking Is Being Affirmed in the United States"]

[Text] San Francisco-Washington-Moscow -- The wind of change for the better in Soviet-U.S. relations is strengthening in the United States. True, at the present it is felt not so much in government corridors of power as in broad circles of U.S. society. In order not to make unsubstantiated statements about its elite, I will mention that when I met U.S. financial tycoon George Sores [name as published] in New York, he expressed a desire to set up a philanthropic foundation which would operate on the basis of Soviet laws (!) and would facilitate the development of cultural and scientific links between the United States and the USSR. With this in view, Sores is ready to donate $1 million as a start.

The wind of detente is also penetrating the mass media, arousing confusion among venerable Sovietologists and anti-Sovietists. They do in fact have reason to clutch their heads. For to the question: "Can the Russians be trusted?" -- to their amazement, increasingly large numbers of Americans are answering: "Yes"! Here is just one example. In April this year PEOPLE magazine published on the whole quite a good piece about the life of Soviet people. The majority of Americans were delighted at such boldness on the part of the publishers. Bradley Odett from Maine expressed his approval as follows in a letter to the magazine's editorial office: "Once again I saw that people are people, irrespective of their political ideologies. With two such similar nations, nowadays peace for all time seems quite possible." Carmen Volkansik from Texas writes: "I applaud your efforts to tell us about the faces and hearts of these people. If we agree that our political ideologies are different and do not try to change one another, we will then, as people, be able to be friends."

The question "Can the Americans be trusted?" naturally perturbed U.S. representatives of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat, invited to California by the U.S. organization "World Without War." And our impressions from meetings with them in California and Washington, at the Federation of American Scientists and the U.S. National Academy of Sciences would have to be summed up with the word: "Yes"! They are for the most part normal, amiable people. As a people, the Americans undoubtedly deserve respect. On the other hand there are still many of them who have a very distorted impression of the Soviet Union and our people. And this is not surprising. For the image of the "Soviet enemy" is foisted upon the average American every day, and I would even say every hour. For example, U.S. television regularly shows cheap anti-Soviet movies. The cost of this massive attack in terms of the common sense of many Americans is distressingly obvious. I will illustrate this with an example. On the morning of 5 May Peter Ustinov, the famous actor and participant in the Moscow forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity," appeared on U.S. television (ABC). He talked about the great changes in the USSR and called for the normalization of Soviet-American relations. "Have you been brainwashed?" the moderator asked him. "Because in our country we think that they cannot be trusted, whatever they say!" "Have I been brainwashed?" Ustinov said in amazement. He went on to rightly remark that the Americans who never travel anywhere, know little, and read the same newspaper are the ones who are brainwashed.

Nonetheless, through the dense wall of weeds and numerous cliches about the "aggressive Soviets," the new thinking in the nuclear age is breaking through among the inhabitants of two-story America -- and it is precisely in such houses that the great majority of Americans live. [paragraph continues]

They are so drawn toward it that people in official Washington are seriously concerned. For the U.S. presidential election campaign is already sweeping the U.S. political elite. In a year and a half Reagan goes. Who will take his place? What political plaftform will the candidates run for election on? Will they once again eulogize the arms race and shrill demonic accusations at the "evil empire"? That is the old decrepit platform. Will it succeed again in the exhausting election struggle? Or perhaps it is necessary to demonstrate state wisdom and stop dividing people into Muscovite "devils" and Washington "angels"?

Of course these are not the only questions filling U.S. politicians' heads today. Nonetheless, I don't think I will be wrong if I say that never before has such great interest in building normal Soviet-U.S. relations been observed among ordinary Americans. It is true that there is also great opposition to it. The conglomerate of anti-Soviet forces in the United States is continuing to endeavor to blacken the very idea of the possibility of Soviet-U.S. accords on the most important problems of war and peace. The military-industrial complex, the ultraconservatives, and the foreign policy dogmatists -- and there are plenty of such people in the United States -- have all launched into new anti-Soviet provocations -- for example, spy mania. They foster hostility toward the Soviet Union as much as they can. The journalist Norman Podhoretz, for example, went so far as to claim that history will show that the reforms being carried out in the USSR dimension will "result in aggression abroad."

These circles consider that confrontation in relations with the USSR must be the leitmotiv of U.S. foreign policy. But their positions are no longer as firm as they were during the first 6 years of the Reagan Presidency.

The United States in April-May 1987 is at a stage of ferment and quest for a renewed basis for its foreign policy. The powerful impulses of the new political thinking and the restructuring and democratization of socialist society in the USSR are acting as a marked catalyst for common sense in the Americans' approach to our country.

...Theodore Taylor from Mayland, a major U.S. scientist and physicist, made, as he himself says, an appreciable contribution in the past to developing U.S. nuclear programs. We talked with him in a sunny glade at the U.S. "House of Scientists," so to speak, in the small town of Airlie. Here in the Washington suburbs where "brainstorming sessions" to seek solutions to problems of peace and disarmament are regularly held, Taylor says with conviction: "The survival of civilization depends on whether we can control the arms race and engage in cooperation between states, especially between the United States and the USSR. Such cooperation will pose a threat to no one and will benefit everyone."

Another very well known U.S. physicist, Professor Frank von Hippel of Princeton University, joined in the conversation. "Who are we? Where are we going?" he asked. And he gave the answer himself. "The United States, like the Soviet Union, is experiencing a difficult period of transition from old to new thinking. Here in our country, the old thinking appears stronger, since many of our government officials represent it and do not fully understand the realities of the nuclear age. The new thinking conforms with these realities and cannot be denied."

I started to tell Frank about the Soviet leadership's recent foreign policy initiatives. I felt that he was very familiar with them. The destinies of the United States and the USSR, Von Hippel considers, are closely linked. "When, under Mikhail Gorbachev's leadership," he says, "the new thinking is transformed into actions, it is thereby also reinforced in the West. [paragraph continues]

"Many of us understand that reactions in the West to the processes now taking place in your country can both strengthen and weaken the new thinking in the USSR. Therefore we are working particularly hard to ensure that the West reacts positively to the historic opportunities which are now opening up."

The conversation with Taylor and Von Hippel was not an exception. For example, I spoke with Gordon Thompson, director of the Institute of Security Resources and Problems in Massachusetts. He said with conviction: "Our countries have fallen into the trap of dangerous nuclear confrontation, which diverts our attention from pressing problems influencing the fate of all mankind. The time has come for us to solve these problems together with you, and maybe our mutual fears will disappear during this process. For example, through joint efforts both our countries could supply all Africa with drinking water by the year 2000." Agreeing with the American, I could not help thinking that the Soviet Union has already essentially proposed a real way to resolve similar large-scale international problems in putting forward the program to destroy all nuclear weapons by the year 2000. During the course of its implementation opportunities would also naturally arise to implement a "Disarmament for Development" action program. Without the former the latter essentially cannot occur in the "Third World." And without considerable financial and economic aid the possibility of survival is called into question for hundreds of millions of people in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. It is precisely the arms race, where the old militarist thinking tries to "call the tune" in international relations, that shuts up in a bottle labeled "cold war" effective actions to deliver most of humanity from hunger, disease, and poverty.

Sober thoughts are being expressed today in the United States by those who comparatively recently were still sitting in the trenches of "psychological warfare." Former CIA Director William Colby participated in the discussions in Airlie at the invitation of the Federation of American Scientists.

I asked Colby: "How do you see the present and the future of Soviet-U.S. relations?" Colby pondered for a short while and, carefully picking his words, said that the United States and Russia need sober assessments of present-day realities. "We," Colby said, "must avoid erroneous assessments of one another. That is fraught with danger." When I remarked that the plans to extend the arms race to space present the greatest danger to us all, Colby replied: "The Strategic Defense Initiative will not work, but at the same time it is very dangerous. Moreover, it is money down the drain. It sets us at odds with one another and breeds the sort of reactions that we must avoid." This quite realistic assessment of SDI by a U.S. conservative is shared by an overwhelming number of leading U.S. scientists.

The main impression from my meetings with Americans in April-May 1987 is this: The number of people among them who believe that by joint efforts the USSR and the United States can build a world without wars is increasing. The members of the Californian organization called "World Without War" spoke about this with the greatest conviction. Their credo is: "We all live on the same planet. It is our common home. Now it is a question of the very existence of mankind and life on earth." Will this philosophy spread in the United States, will it take root? Only time will tell.

But in the United States it is impossible not to see another fact also: the record military budget and the activation of rightwingers like George Will, who are using the mass media to meaningfully remind President Reagan who brought him to power.

Yes, the United States today, as always, is many-sided in its sympathies and antipathies. The kaleidoscope of U.S. political life is constantly moving and changing. [paragraph continues]

The question of whether a time of changes for the better has come in the United States will only be answered when Washington takes real advantage of the unique chance to consolidate peace. The Reagan administration has already let it slip once. Will it do so again?

GERASIMOV-RATHER 'DIALOGUE' ON UNDERSTANDING CITED

LD302130 Moscow TASS in English 2100 GMT 30 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS -- "It is very important for us to get to know each other better since our missiles target each other. If we know each other better we shall ask louder: 'Why? For what purpose?'" Anchorman of "Meszhdunarodnaya Panaorama" TV programme Gennadiy Gerasimov who is popular in the USSR wrote this to his American colleague Dan Rather. They exchanged open letters which were published by the weekly "OGONEK". Gerasimov is of the opinion that distinctions between the two countries should not interfere with the quest for mutual understanding.

In his letter published by "OGONEK" Rather expressed doubts about the success of the effort to combat bureaucratism in the USSR. "Yes, we have started the reorganization", Gerasimov writes in his answer. "It will depend on every person in the USSR if it is carried to completion". But Gerasimov recognises the right of the American TV commentator not to accept as the final answer subjective confidence of Soviet people in the ultimate success. "Time will show, or, more precisely, we will show", the Soviet journalist writes.

Touching upon some pronouncements by Dan Rather about the events in Afghanistan Gerasimov puts the question: "Had Rather not informed his audience that the schedule for the withdrawal of Soviet military units from Kabul had been agreed upon with the Afghan side, that there never had existed plans for Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, that what is needed is an end to the interference by the West, above all by the United States, that the Soviet Union supports the policy of national reconciliation while the United States does not support it?"

Dan Rather is concerned over "a low level of Jewish emigration" from the Soviet Union last year. "This level is not regulated by the authorities. It depends on the number of applications which are considered in a due way. And their number is not growing. One of the reasons is that people believe in greater openness and democratisation and wish to take part in the renewal of our life. There is no need to leave when things are taking a good turn," Gerasimov writes.

"Our knowledge of America is broader than the knowledge of American people about the Soviet Union", Gerasimov writes in his letter. He writes that if Americans were invited to speak on Soviet television in Russian, there would hardly be many people who would be able to do so. A much greater number of people in the Soviet Union has a command of the English language. Doesn't this detail indicate in itself who is striving for mutual understanding more?

AMERICANS' VARIED REACTIONS TO RESTRUCTURING ASSESSED

LD031724 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0430 GMT 3 Jun 87

[Presented by Aleksandr Fedonin]

[Text] The process of restructuring taking place in our country, its [word indistinct] and scope, is evoking the most varied reactions from American people.

As a whole, strengthening democracy and restructuring in the economy, cultural life, and social spheres are engendering a burning interest in the majority of American people and an effort to become acquainted with this generally incomprehensible, and for many of them very unexpected, phenomenon of Soviet reality. But I ask our correspondent in New York, Vladimir Zvyagin, to talk in greater detail about the reaction in the United States to the processes which are taking place in our country:

[Begin recording] [Zvyagin] If one were to analyze how the U.S. mass news media have been reporting on events in the Soviet Union over these last few months, it would become obvious that the overwhelming majority of journalists, commentators, and observers here are frankly bewildered because previous customary standards are no longer applicable, but clearly the news organs here are not as yet ready to explain honestly and openly to the American reader and television viewer what is really taking place in the Soviet Union, although attempts to do so do exist.

A CBS television company film crew returned recently from Moscow. It was headed by Dan Rather, a well-known political observer in the United States. In the words of the members of the group, they were struck by the depth and scale of internal changes in our society; by the purposefulness and at the same time the realistic nature of our economic and social programs, and they were struck by the readiness of both officials and ordinary Soviet citizens to frankly discuss the difficulties and problems of restructuring.

Other television and radio companies also want to expand dialogue with the Soviet side. Discussion is being conducted with the help of telebridges by members of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Congress. If I'm not mistaken, at the moment an unprecedented number of requests have arrived at the USSR's Gosteleradio from American radio stations and television companies, asking for the opportunity to send creative groups to our country to report on meetings with real live Soviet people -- this is what glasnost means here.

[Fedonin] In that case what kind of arguments are being put forward by those who do not accept the processes of restructuring?

[Zvyagin] Quite a few American political figures, primarily those of a rightwing and conservative persuasion, and a number of observers, tried from the very beginning to use restructuring in the USSR as yet another anti-Soviet scarecrow. Look, they said, the new Soviet leadership has acquired yet another propagandist trick to confuse the United States and to (?lower) its vigilance. Then other cock-and-bull stories and conjectures went into play about, for example, the fact that a strong and democratic Soviet Union will inevitably present a threat to the United States' necessary to continue to arm oneself, and so on and so forth. Our own reality exposes such fabrications, both the impressive internal processes, and the obvious readiness of the Soviet leadership to resolve topical problems concerned with the arms race, in the interests of peoples and to strive for disarmament. [end recording]

WU XUEQIAN PLEDGES SUPPORT FOR FRONTLINE STATES

PM021307 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jun 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Stay in Tanzania"]

[Text] Dar es Salaam, 1 Jun -- PRC Minister of Foreign Affairs Wu Xueqian has pointed out the importance of expanding relations between the developing countries. Speaking at a news conference here at the end of his 2-day visit to Tanzania, he stated that the PRC will continue to support the "Frontline" States in their struggle against the RSA regime's aggressive raids. Our assistance to the African countries, he stressed, will continue until the final victory over colonialism, neocolonialism, and racial discrimination.

PUBLISHING COMMISSION DRAFTS LAW ON PRESS ACTIVITY

PM011015 Moscow TRUD in Russian 26 May 87 p 3

[Own correspondent S. Kuznetsov dispatch: "Press Law Under Preparation"]

[Text] Beijing, 25 May -- China has experienced a real newspaper boom in recent years. The reforms and experiments being carried out in managing the economy, the processes of "liberating the mind," as they are called in China, and the thirst for information brought new newspapers, magazines, and other publications into being.

According to figures from the recently created Bureau for Press and Publishing Affairs under the PRC State Council, there are now approximately 1,700 daily newspapers, 5,300 other periodicals, and more than 440 publishing houses in China. These figures are many dozens of times greater than the comparable ones at the beginning of the eighties. But this phenomenon also has adverse consequences. There are not enough trained cadres -- in one province there are only 200 professional journalists for 220 periodicals. Hence the standard of publications is low and stocks of paper and other materials are squandered on press output of a low artistic, ideological, and political standard. Some publications which are not accountable to state and party organs or mass organizations started propagating ideas of a Western life-style, individualism, spiritual aridity, and getting rich by any means.

Du Daozheng, director of the PRC State Publishing Commission [goskomizdat], told journalists he rejected the fabrications of the Hong Kong and Western media alleging the creation of the new body is connected solely with the struggle against "bourgeois liberalism" and has resulted in the closure of virtually one-third of the periodical press. In fact, only four publications have been suspended. These include the SHENZHEN GONGREN BAO. A process of instilling good order in periodical publications and their personnel and ensuring a more equitable distribution of material resources is under way.

A draft press law, whose elaboration has required 2 years of strenuous work on the part of the newly created State Publishing Commission, has been sent to the NPC Standing Committee. The draft amplifies print workers' constitutional rights and the obligations of officials in relations with the press and readers' rights and obligations.

We are not introducing any kind of censorship, Comrade Du replied, unless, of course, the matter affects China's military security or the results of advanced scientific and technical research, as is customary in most civilized states.

DAILY NOTES OPENING OF ELECTRONICS EXHIBITION

PM030815 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 27 May 27 p 3

[Report "for SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA" by TASS correspondent V. Tomilin: "Meeting World Standards"]

[Text] Beijing -- The displays at the first all-China exhibition of products of the PRC electronics industry, which has opened in Shanghai, introduces the uninitiated into the mysterious world of microcircuitry. More than 360 of the country's scientific and production organizations presenting 2,500 samples of their products and new electronic equipment are taking part in it.

The participation of a number of Chinese higher educational institutions, whose students have come up with a whole series of original solutions to problems in the electronics sphere in recent years, is a notable feature of the fair. Despite the "narrow specialist" nature of the displays, the fair is not attracting only scientists and industralists. Separate sections inform visitors about the "household equipment" that is beginning to become part and parcel of the everyday life of the country's urban and rural dwellers.

China's electronics industry, the newspaper GONGREN RIBAO points out, which was founded in the fifties with the help of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, has been transformed into an independent sector of the PRC national economy. Today's main emphasis is on improving electronic instruments' reliability.

Discussing this problem, the Chinese press writes about the frequent complaints from the trade network and consumers prompted by the poor quality of electronic watches, musical instruments, and a number of other goods.

In this regard the PRC Ministry of the Electronics Industry has set itself the task of bringing all the production of the main kinds of goods up to world standards by the end of 1990.

USSR, PRC PUBLISHING BODIES SIGN PROTOCOL

PM291421 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Protocol Signed"]

[Text] Beijing, 28 May -- A protocol on a business exchange between the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade and the PRC Administration for the Press and Publishing Houses for 1988-1989 was signed here today. The document provides for a wider exchange of books between the two countries and measures to increase the publication of books by Soviet and Chinese authors and to exchange representatives of publishing, printing, and the book trade. An accord was reached to exchange specialists -- editors and translators -- to assist in the translating and editing of books. The protocol provides for a continued exchange of book exhibitions.

AFGHAN LEADER ANNOUNCES EXTENSION OF CEASE-FIRE

LD031045 Moscow TASS in English 0928 GMT 3 Jun 87

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS — The government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan (DRA) intends to extend the moratorium on combat operations, said Najib.

The general secretary of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) Central Committee, who was interviewed by the weekly MOSCOW NEWS (Russian language edition), noted that the DRA leadership did not harbour illusions that the undeclared war would end at once when it launched the idea of national reconciliation.

But over the last several months, it dawned upon millions of Afghans that there were no alternatives to the policy of national reconciliaton. Counter-revolutionary armed groups now mount attacks on those who have been together with them in the mountains recently rather than on army posts and troops. Several former leaders of large gangs vigorously work in bodies of state authority in provinces and villages.

Najib pointed out that none of the Afghan govenments had such a powerful army in terms of combat capabilities. Today, too, we should solve a good deal of problems by military methods but we hold dear the life of each Afghan irrespective of the side on which he fights, he said.

Dwelling on the impediments created in the way of refugees returning to Afghanistan, Najib said that a variety of methods were employed apart from border barriers. Subsidies are increased to refugees in Pakistani and Iranian camps in order to make them stay.

In exploiting the refugee problem, in the United States, in European capitals, in Islamabad and Tehran they underscore in every way the importance of the humanitarian aid to people worn out by the war. But as soon as refugees state their intention to return to Afghanistan, they are denied aid at once, he said.

MULTILATERAL TALKS ON GULF SHIPPING SAFETY PROPOSED

LD031511 Moscow TASS in English 1451 GMT 3 Jun 87

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS — "The Persian Gulf region is situated in direct proximity to Soviet southern borders, and we are far from being indifferent to how the situation is taking shape there", stated Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR.

In an interview given to a correspondent of the MOSCOW NEWS weekly upon returning from a tour of Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, Oman, and Iraq, he emphasized that attacks on foreign ships were the most flagrant violations of the rules of international shipping and of international law.

He said the USSR reserved a right to act according to international laws if provocative actions with regard to Soviet ships were repeated.

Vladimir Petrovskiy said piratic actions against peaceful ships increased the explosiveness of the situation in the region and opened the way for a build-up of U.S military presence in the Persian Gulf.

"Such a situation calls for urgent and effective measures by the international community to prevent a further escalation and to bring about an end to the senseless Iranian-Iraqi war."

"The Persian Gulf is part of the Indian Ocean, and we suggest beginning multilateral talks to work out guarantees of the safety of sea lanes in the Indian Ocean as a whole and in the Gulf in particular."

"There is a radical way to achieve that: to convene an international conference on making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. The Soviet Union supports the proposal on holding it in 1988," Vladimir Petrovskiy pointed out.

"An exchange of views with the leaders of the Gulf countries on the issues of a Middle East settlement makes it possible to draw the conclusion that there is concensus among them in favour of the USSR idea of convening an international middle East Peace conference with the participation of all the sides concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organizaton (PLO) together with the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council."

"At present one can already speak of practical preparation for convening such a conference as soon as possible," the deputy minister emphasized.

U.S. HOLDS 'NO SCRUPLES' IN GULF PLANS

LD302228 Moscow TASS in English 2221 GMT 30 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Boris Shabayev writes:

Washington has no scruples about the means it uses in the pursuit of the long-cherished dream of the Pentagon strategists: Permanent U.S. military presence in the Persian Gulf. And to justify its hegemonistic aims, Washington distorts everything, above all, naturally, the Soviet Union's stand.

Thus Frank Carlucci, who was promoted to the post of assistant to the President for national security affairs, said with enviable self-assurance that the United States "does not like" the Soviet Union's presence in the Middle East since it "does not hold" that the USSR plays a constructive role there. Our strategic interests lie in the United States keeping its ships in the Gulf, he said.

What he said about the ships is true. This truth was confirmed by such a figure highly knowledgeable about the United States' "strategic interests" as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral William Crowe. He easily convinced the President of the need, as THE WASHINGTON POST put it, for a long-term U.S. military presence in the Persian Gulf. But permit us not to agree with Mr. Carlucci as to who plays a constructive role in the Middle East and who doesn't.

To begin with, the present tense situation in the Persian Gulf is the consequence of the fratricidal Iran-Iraq war which is in its seventh year. From the very first day of that pointless conflict, the Soviet Union, alongside the overwhelming majority of Arab countries, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Islamic Conference Organization, the Organization of African Unity, has been exerting every effort toward ending the bloodshed and achieving a peaceful political settlement. This striving precisely motivates the Soviet policy of strict neutrality in the conflict of the two neighbour countries. It is an undoubted fact that this stand has been highly appraised by many leaders of Islamic Countries.

The role of the United States in that war which, according to press reports, has taken the toll of no less than one million lives is shown most fully by testimonies of persons involved in the "Irangate" scandal. Over several years, the United States, trumpeting its "neutrality," has been supplying on the sly one of the warring sides with armaments and spares to the earlier supplied U.S. military equipment. In other words, the United States has been pouring oil into the flames, biding its time to bring its armed forces into the area.

If the Washington administration calls this "a constructive policy," it will not be amiss to note that even Barry Goldwater, who shares political views of the present chief of the White House, does not agree to such an appraisal. In his opinion, Reagan fell flat on his face when he sanctioned "amoral" actions of his administration. THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR notes that a similar viewpoint is held by the United States allies. The newspaper writes they lost faith in the ability of the Reagan administration to work out a serious foreign policy and to pursue it in earnest. The Western Europeans view the foreign policy course of the White House as disorderly, unpredictable and unreliable. This is why other countries will prefer to have nothing to do with the Washington administration as regards the Persian Gulf, the newspaper writes in conclusion.

It can hardly be surmised that the closest assistant to the President of the USA has no knowledge of these facts. It is not for the lack of knowledge that he distorts the truth. In doing so he moves in a rut which the U.S. Administration cannot abandon. It pursues its line of slandering the Soviet Union, of ascribing to it the intentions and actions which do not take place. And in so doing it tries to camouflage its own sordid actions.

U.S FUELS 'CONFRONTATION' WITH USSR OVER GULF

PM031611 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jun 87 Morning Edition p 4

["Political Observer's Opinion" by Vikentiy Matreyev: "What Are They After?"]

[Text] What is it: The inertia of the long postwar years of a deliberate wish to complicate the already complex and dangerous situation in the Persian Gulf?

The question comes to mind when one reads President Reagan's 29 May statement on the situation in that region. The Iran-Iraq war is ruinous not only for the two countries involved; it has also caused a marked increase in tension on a wider scale. Efforts are being made at the United Nations to halt this bloody conflict and to prevent new dangerous complications. Now the head of the U.S. Administration comes out with a statement in which with no justification at all — there is none! -- he tries to give the impression that the menacing situation in the Persian Gulf has arisen "through the fault" of the Soviet Union.

This "revelation" was preceded in the statement by a kind of psychological preparation consisting of pictures of "demoralizing queues for gasoline, shortages, rationing, inflation" and such things, unless "vitally important U.S. interests" are protected in the Persian Gulf.

It is reasonable to ask whether the fueling of an atmosphere of confrontation between the United States and the USSR comes under the heading of "interests." It is no idle question. The very day when the U.S. President was stating that there exists a threat of "the Soviet Union imposing its will on friendly (to the United States) Arab states of the Persian Gulf," another Washington official — Assistant Secretary of State R. Murphy — explained that "our (U.S.) policy is motivated by reluctance to allow the Soviets to obtain a lever of influence in this vitally important seaway...."

Why all this fueling of mythical fears? Is the already tense situation in the Persian Gulf not enough for the members of the U.S. Administration and do they want to excite passions even more?

As is known, during the exchange of views between the USSR and the United States on the problem of regional conflicts, the sides were unanimous in their wish not to generate an atmosphere of Soviet-U.S. confrontation in such crisis situations, but to exercise maximum mutual restraint and to settle anything that might have serious consequences.

The Warsaw Pact states, at their Berlin meeting, confirmed their readiness to overcome confrontational approaches and to establish civilized norms, openness, and trust in international relation.

You cannot act in any other way in the modern world if you are guided by a real concern for the stabilization of the international situation, especially in regions where tension reigns.

Evidently, in the White House such concern, as far as the Persian Gulf is concerned, is totally absent.

GOVERNMENT CONDOLENCES SENT ON KARAMI DEATH

PM020953 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Telegram of Condolence"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers has sent Amin al-Jumayyil, president of the Republic of Lebanon, a telegram expressing feelings of sorrow at the tragic death of Rashid Karami, chairman of the Council of Ministers and foreign minister of the Republic of Lebanon, and also conveying condolences to the people of Lebanon and to the relatives and friends of the deceased.

R. Karami, the telegram states, is known as a prominent statesman and politician and as a patriot who advocated his country's national unity and the further development of friendly Soviet-Lebanese ties.

TASS COMMENTARY SEES ISRAEL BEHIND KARAMI DEATH

LD021546 Moscow TASS in English 1448 GMT 2 Jun 87

[Text] Moscow June 2 TASS — TASS Commentator Grigoriy Vasilyev writes:

The news of the foul murder of Rashid Karami, prime minister of Lebanon, has sparked off outrage both in Lebanon and in the entire Arab East. The man who won merited esteem as a consistent and staunch fighter for the independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon, a country which belongs to the Arab world, has died.

Karami was known as a great Lebanese politician who came out against the imperialist quarters' intrigues in the region, for the liberation of his homeland from the Israeli invaders.

Political news analysts are unanimous that the traces of the gory crime are leading to Israel and its agents, which have been engaged in the provocative subversive activity designed to destabilize the situation in Lebanon and around it for many years now. Noteworthy is the fact that this activity is stepped up each time when signs of the normalization of the situation in the country emerge, when the prospect of reaching accords among various Lebanese warring factions become a reality.

The enemies of Lebanon would like to see that country divided, split into "mini-states" on religious and communal grounds and isolated from Arab neighbours. Israel's ruling Zionist hierarchy is after the same objectives. It does not conceal its annexationist bids as regards the occupied areas of south Lebanon.

It is indicative that the villainous murder of Rashid Karami was denounced by all Lebanese parties and groups, among them the political opponents of the late prime minister. At this strenuous moment, Lebanon's patriotic forces issued a call for national unity, for giving fresh impetus to the struggle against the Israeli invaders and a strong rebuff to all hostile plans hatched against lebanon.

PROTOCOL SIGNED WITH INDIA ON SPACE EXPLORATION

LD021052 Moscow TASS in English 0940 GMT 2 Jun 87

[Text] New Delhi June 2 TASS — TASS correspondent Leonid Kotov reports:

The signing of a protocol on cooperation between the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Monitoring the Environmental Control and the Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO) in the city of Bangalore (Karnataka State) started a new stage in Soviet-Indian cooperation aimed at using space explorations for peaceful purposes. The document provides for further joint experiments to study atmospheric events with meteorological rockets, explorations of the upper and medium layers of the atmosphere, collection of scientific data for global mathematical simulation of weather conditions on the earth and in various areas of the earth's surface.

results of Soviet-Indian cooperation in space meteorology were discussed at a inar of Soviet and Indian scientists in Bangalore. Its participants highly raised joint work on collecting weather data with meteorological rockets and h-altitude balloons fitted out with Soviet and Indian instrumentation to study the ration of atmospheric events and to monitor the state of the ionosphere. Their nchings from the range of the Indian space centre in Tumba gave experts a unique nce to study the nature of equatorial ion movement in the upper layers of the osphere and to conduct experiments for forecasting weather in the interests of ia's social and economic development.

RAN CLAIMS PART OF 'ANTI-SOVIET CAMPAIGN'

031621 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 21, 24 May 87 p 5

[kolay Zaborin article: "Tehran As Georgia's Capital?"]

[xt] A pro-government Tehran-published newspaper JOMHURI-E ESLAMI has alleged that n considers the Soviet Republics of Tajikistan, Turkmenia, Uzbekistan, and certain eas in Georgia as part of its national territory. The statement said that these eas have to be liberated, since "these territories belonging to the Soviet Union were ized from Persia by tsarist Russia."

at is putting it too strongly, but is it correct?

rdly any contemporary state is contained within the same borders as in olden days. roughout the centuries, states expanded and shrank, united and fell apart, emerged d disappeared. Russo-Iranian relations were not free from problems too. Wars tween Russia and Iran, fought in the 19th century, ended in treaties acknowledged by oth states. It is absurd to appeal to the past and lay down territorial claims now, n the conditions of the long-settled and internationally recognized state borders.

ccording to the West German DER SPIEGEL magazine, the article in JOMHURI-E ESLAMI eflects Tehran's dissatisfaction with the Soviet stand in the Iran-Iraq conflict. Why re the Iranians dissatisfied? The USSR, as do many other countries, believes that the ulf war is senseless and futile, and favours a peaceful settlement of the conflict by olitical means. Does this position run counter to the interests of the people of ran? Wouldn't the end of the bloody war mean an end to senseless murder?

herefore, there seem to be other reasons for that article: its authors are inspired y those circles who are eager to breed animosity among Iranians towards the Soviet eople, and use such artificially created sentiments for their own selfish ends.

n anti-Soviet campaign is being fanned lately in the Iranian press, so the bove-mentioned article does not seem to be incidental.

GROMYKO SPEAKS TO NEW CSSR ENVOY ON PACT PROPOSALS

LD031556 Moscow TASS in English 1522 GMT 3 Jun 87

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, received Indrich Regorek, the ambassador of Czechoslovakia, in the Kremlin today.

The ambassador presented his credentials.

Andrey Gromyko cordially welcomed the ambassador as an official representative of the fraternal socialist state, "the Czechoslovakia with which we are brought together by indissoluble ties of friendship and cooperation."

He said a few words about relations between the member countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. "The recently-concluded session of the Political Consultative Committee (PCC) in Berlin became another manifestation of the countries' unity both in foreign-policy issues in general, and in European security issues, in particular".

"The PCC session adopted a communique and an exceptionally important document on the military doctrine of the Warsaw Treaty member states, the doctrine which is of strictly defensive nature." Andrey Gromyko touched upon the question of how activities connected with the Soviet proposals on the issues of reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons would proceed.

"The proposals," he recalled, "are on the table of the U.S. Administration. Officials in Washington say that they are actively and specifically studying our proposals. They are doing that for too long".

"One cannot yet say definitely now that once the door is open, an agreement is already there, behind it. There is no final official reply from the U.S. side so far on issues on which agreement is necessary."

AIR FORCE CHIEF YEFIMOV LEAVES FOR GDR

PM031559 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Jun 87 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "On an Official Visit"]

[Text] Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, commander in chief of the Air Forces and USSR deputy minister of defense, left Moscow for Berlin 3 June on an official visit at the invitation of Colonel General W. Reinhold, GDR deputy minister for national defense and chief of the Air Force and Air Defense Command.

Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov was seen off at the airport by Army General I.M. Tretyak, USSR deputy defense minister, and other generals and officers.

The send-off party included Major General H. Oldenburg, military, naval, and air force attache at the GDR Embassy in the USSR.

PRODUCTION COOPERATION WITH BULGARIA CRITIQUED

PM021029 Moscow TRUD in Russian 21 May 87 p 3

[Special correspondent A. Kalashnikov article under the rubric "Direct Ties -- Direct Benefit": "Obstacles Between Partners: New Forms of Cooperation Are Being Established Between USSR and Bulgarian Enterprises"]

[Text] The recent Soviet-Bulgarian seminar in Moscow in which leaders and party secretaries of many cooperating enterprises took part provided a wealth of material for consideration and for conclusions to be drawn on the development of new forms of socialist economic integration.

There are now almost 100 enterprises of this type on each side. Having established direct production links they cooperate without going through intermediary foreign trade channels and independently resolve all problems as they arise. The above figure includes 11 Soviet-Bulgarian science-and-production associations as well as the first and to date, unfortunately, the only joint enterprise based on common ownership -- this is the supreme form of integration today.

Of greater importance than the quantitative aspect, however, is the question of cooperation quality.

It was noted at the seminar that of the aforementioned 100 pairs of enterprises no more than one-third have production-sharing links -- reciprocal deliveries and the creation of a joint end product. Cooperation among the other partners is superficial in character. Only 10 sets of partners are geared toward tackling the tasks posed by the Comprehensive Program for CEMA Countries' Scientific and Technical Progress Through the Year 2000. Only on rare occasions is cooperation aimed at raising the technical standard and quality of coproduced output. The partners, as a rule, set their sights no higher than the existing equivalents produced by Western firms, sometimes by no means the most advanced ones, either. Many agreements are imprecise and are worded merely in terms of what the sides wish. There are few examples in which the partners negotiate collaboration throughout the "development-production-sale" chain, joint entry into the world market, and the replacement of unnecessary Western imports.

Thus the process of establishing new forms of integration is not progressing as quickly and efficiently as required. What obstacles are there to partnership?

It was claimed until recently that the need for direct links was merely stated and that the real conditions had not been provided for putting them into practice. But the situation has changed radically now! CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions were adopted last August on restructuring all foreign economic activity.

The purpose of the changes is to achieve the maximum independence at local level. Many enterprises and associations have been given the right of direct entry into the foreign market. All the restrictions on the choice of partners within CEMA countries have actually been removed. All cooperation agreements between enterprises are fully included in sector development plans and are provided with material supplies. The income from joint operations is left at the labor collectives' disposal and is used to develop production, provide material incentives, and meet social needs.

In brief, conditions are being created to encourage direct links not on orders from above but on the grounds of economic interest. So far, the process of establishing "direct" cooperation has been accelerated by intergovernmental agreements, including one between the Soviet Union and Bulgaria, which recommend future partners to enterprises. Economists believe this is logical: Instead of waiting for conditions to materialize which are the most favorable for the broad development of new forms of integration, their development is to be promoted, even if this means trial and error.

Improvements have already been achieved.

"If I had been told before what rights and opportunities I would have today in the development of international cooperation, I would not have believed it," V. Kabaidze, general director of the Ivanovskoye machine building association, said at the seminar. "Thousands of rules which used to seem immutable laws have been revised in the interests of the cause."

D. Chesnokov, deputy general director of the Krasnyy Proletariy association, cited the following example: In March this year the enterprise was in a difficult situation because of disruptions to supplies of Hungarian components -- pneumatic motors. We called our Bulgarian partners at the Beroe association. "Can you help us out?" "Yes." Within a few days the necessary quantity of motors was shipped to Moscow from Stara Zagora. By then they had already concluded a contract, agreed prices, and drawn up the necessary documents. And all this by themselves, without any intermediaries.

Direct links are becoming really direct. But by no means all problems have been cleared up. This point was made by every speaker at the seminar. And the most serious question (the "nasty" one, as one director said), is that of prices.

Here is an example. The Volgotsemmash production association cooperates with a heavy machine building plant in Ruse in the production of hammer crushers. General director V. Kopin remarked that this production sharing was unprofitable for the Soviet side because the cost of the Bulgarian subassemblies and components was three to four times higher than Soviet counterparts.

The cooperating partners are usually at different levels of production, technology, and labor productivity. Most directors believe that the price question must be resolved urgently at all levels. This is happening. The reform of the currency and finance system of cooperation, which would guarantee the convertibility of the transfer ruble into the socialist countries' national currencies and valid exchange rates, is on the CEMA agenda.

At the same time, the seminar stressed, there is no point in overdramatizing the present situation. Mutually acceptable schemes, as the best collectives' experience shows, can be found today. It is possible to carry out careful calculations, detect the reasons for the rise in production costs, and remove them through joint efforts by improving techniques, raising the standard of production, modernizing it, and training cadres.

Yet another headache for economic managers is the imbalance in supplies based on cooperation deals. Imports must pay for exports. Under a cooperation arrangement the Pobeda combine in the Bulgarian city of Sliven supplies Moscow's 50-Letiye SSSR production association with conveyors and loading devices for automated production lines. B. Penev, director of the Bulgarian combine, would like to receive in exchange output, but output which his partner in Moscow does not produce. So for the moment the supplies on cooperation terms are one-sided. With the restructuring of material and technical supplies enterprise leaders will have room to maneuver and the opportunity to interest partners in expanding cooperation.

The opportunity and the need to find new partners arises here. B. Zhelev, director general of the Biotekh economic association in Varna, sees market research as badly organized both nationally and at CEMA level. He described how a special Bulgarian exhibition on problems of biotechnology held in Moscow was attended by only 15 people. Five directors from Bulgaria attended, and if their Soviet colleagues had turned up, many potential partners would certainly have found one another.

In short, the economic, currency, financial, and organizational mechanisms of cooperation still need to be improved. However, as the discussion at the seminar showed, the main problem today is the need for restructuring of ideas on the part of the actual participants in direct ties and the need for initiative, enterprise, determination, and a quest for mutually acceptable cooperation schemes. Of course, the long years of lack of coordination between industry and foreign trade were bound to have an effect: Many managers have no interest in foreign economic activity and lack the necessary knowledge.

Enterprises need ministry support in this new, complex business. But the ministries are sometimes in no hurry to come to their assistance. In particular, ministries and departments in both countries are rendering poor assistance to the first joint enterprise, Avtoelektronika, in the supply of components. Its director, K. Arnaudov, complained that the question of recruiting Soviet specialists for work at Plovdiv is still unresolved and the delay in opening of an office for the joint enterprise in Moscow has been dragging on.

Soviet participants in the seminar noted that in a number of cases Bulgarian partners are not showing sufficient industry in setting up direct ties. Proposals submitted back at the end of the year by Soviet organizations to establish contacts among enterprises in the sphere of machine building for the light and food industries, heavy machine building, and machine tool building and also to create a joint enterprise producing canned baby food have been under consideration for a long time now.

The work of cable layers in both countries stands out favorably here. The leaders of the All-Union Institute of the Cable Industry and the Burgas Kabeli i Provoda combine formulated a detailed cooperation program, which contains specific mutual commitments on the part of participants throughout the "development-production-sales" cycle. The aim is to achieve the highest standards of joint output which will be competitive on the world market.

It is natural that the participants in the new forms of integration are initially affected by lack of cooperation experience. They will certainly experience difficulties and make mistakes. But the features of the outmoded economic mechanisms at both national and CEMA level slowing down restructuring are already coming to light. It is now easier to dispose of them. The main thing is to search persistently for ways to solve issues based on mutual benefit and good will and to demonstrate a desire for cooperation.

BULGARIA'S ZHIVKOV MEETS FRG'S GENSCHER IN BONN

LD031828 Moscow TASS in English 1624 GMT 3 Jun 87

[Text] Bonn June 3 TASS -- Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and chairman of Bulgaria's State Council, on an official visit to the Federal Republic of Germany, met here today with West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

They discussed topical issues of the international situation, above all disarmament and arms control problems, in the light of the Soviet proposals for eliminating medium-range and shorter-range missiles in Europe.

According to the West German Foreign Ministry, the talks also focused on issues of developing East-West cooperation.

The sides came out in favour of broader cooperation between European states in the interests of strengthening trust between them, promoting cooperation in economy, science, culture and other fields.

ROMANIAN MEDIA SURVEYED ON GORBACHEV VISIT

LD271231 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 27 May 87

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, continues his official visit of friendship to Romania. Our special correspondent Vyacheslav Lavrentyev reports:

The daily SCINTEIA, organ of the Romanian CP Central Committee, uses the following words for its heading for an extensive selection of materials on Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit: A Vivid Reflection of the Traditional Ties of Friendship Between Our Parties and Peoples, in the Name of Peace, Detente, and Disarmament.

The press in Romania publishes the speeches of the leaders of the Communist Parties of both countries, delivered during the Romanian-Soviet friendship meeting and an account from Comrade Gorbachev's meeting with the working people of the Bucharest 23 August Works.

The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, writes ROMANIA LIBERA, called for a thoroughgoing improvement in the work of the CEMA Council and for the level of economic interaction and its results for each of the participants to be enhanced. The key to solving the most important economic and social problems of the socialist community, says the paper, quoting Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's words, is to be found in microelectronics, biotechnology, and other frontranking sectors of scientific knowledge. As the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee noted, the USSR and Romania have all the opportunities for an accelerated progress in the sphere of scientific and technological ties. The qualitative changes in cooperation will not just yield material dividends -- they will also influence fruitfully the Soviet-Romanian relations as a whole.

The Romanian papers also single out the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's words in support of Romania's peace-loving foreign policy initiatives. The USSR, writes the selfsame ROMANIA LIBERA, regards the Balkan states' efforts to turn their region into a zone of peace and cooperation as an inalienable part of the pan-European process and is ready to facilitate in every way the process of a stable and healthy atmosphere being formed in the Balkans.

The CPSU Central Committee general secretary's visit, note observers, has eloquently demonstrated that the USSR and Romania have identical approaches to implementing the national development plans and to solving global problems of disarmament; preventing nuclear war.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON FRG PILOT LANDING CASE

Arbatov Discusses Case

LD011831 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 1 Jun 87

[Excerpts] The seventh congress of the international movement International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War ended its work today in Moscow. A news conference, on which our special correspondent Andrey Ptashnikov reports, took place on the results at the congress press center. [passage omitted]

[Ptashnikov] In the course of the news conference, its participants were also asked a number of questions that were not directly related to the work of the congress, but that are of great interest to journalists today, especially Western journalists. For example, a question by THE NEW YORK TIMES correspondent, Bill Keller:

[Begin Keller recording in English with superimposed Russian translation by Ptashnikov] What lessons should the West draw from the recent reshuffle of the Soviet military leadership in connection with the case of the landing of a West German light aircraft in Moscow? [end recording] This question was responded to by Academician Arbatov, director of the United States and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, who was taking part in the news conference:

[Begin Arbatov recording] One of the lessons is that you shouldn't fly over another country's territory, because this can lead to serious unpleasantness. In this case, the Politburo of our party has stressed in its decision that we consider the military leaders guilty for not intercepting the flight with nonviolent, noncombat means. This is, this is not an appeal to shoot down every airplane, but an appeal to use the other means at our disposal so as not to allow this.

But I think that — speaking about more general conclusions — this has shown once again that, alas, one cannot rely very strongly on technology. Nor can one rely very strongly on people. Both make mistakes. Therefore, what the physicians organization has come out with — that there is only one remedy against nuclear war, which is prevention — I believe retains its force. Almost every day something takes place which should confirm this certainty for us — both the Challenger catastrophe, and Chernobyl, and even the case of this airplane." [end recording] [passage omitted]

FRG Press Speculates on Motives

LD031313 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1108 GMT 3 Jun 87

[Text] Bonn, 3 Jun (TASS) — TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov reports:

Among the reports in the FRG papers couched in the spirit of cheap sensationalism concerning the violation of USSR airspace by a light aircraft flown by FRG citizen Mathias Rust are articles which raise alarming issues of possible backstage reasons for this incident. Was this violation really unintentional? Or are we talking about a premeditated action?

As the RHEINISCHE POST, a newspaper close to the Christian Democratic Union writes, Moscow is currently checking whether somebody was behind the FRG pilot, and whether he might have been the gullible victim of a far-reaching plan.

One reason why the USSR might think this, writes the paper, is the fact that the trangressor's flight coincided with two important political events: the conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee in Berlin, and the seventh congress of the international movement "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War," which ended in Moscow and which was expected to yield a wide response. Instead, says the paper, Rust became the center of attention of the Western mass media.

The RHEINISCHE POST does not reject the following supposition, either: Since confidence in the USSR has increased in the West, the opponents of detente were trying to provoke the USSR into dealing with the border violation by military means, which would lead to a public outcry, and cause the USSR to be isolated and the Geneva disarmament talks to be blocked.

One way or another, much in this whole episode remains unclear. Thus, in the heat of the pursuit for details of the incident, the FRG information agencies originally reported that some "woman passenger" was supposedly involved in Rust's flights. It is not certain just who this "mysterious stranger" was or why there is still nothing known about her. Furthermore, all the television channels in the FRG, and indeed in other Western countries, are peddling shots filmed in Moscow by "a tourist" who recorded the aircraft landing. In the opinion of the AUGSBURGER ALLGEMEINE, this film was shot to a highly professional standard. It is not easy to believe, writes the paper, that some professional cameraman just happened to be in the place where the airplane landed.

Another thing that attracts attention is that certain quarters in the FRG are trying to make out that the "violation was a mistake," and that 'what we have here is not espionage or provocation." The reaction of a representative of Bonn's military department was also indicative: Peter Murt Wuerzbach, a state secretary in the FRG Ministry of Defense, announced that Rust's flight testified to the need to teach Air Force personnel the art of the hedge-hopping flight.

Meanwhile, it has come to light that the HAMBURG STERN magazine has concluded a deal with the pilot's parents for the exclusive publication of materials connected with the incident. The head of the family refused point blank to disclose to journalists the amount of money involved. It is worth noting that as soon as the violation of USSR airspace became known, the Cologne EXPRESS newspaper quoted M. Rust's parents thus: "None of this story is his doing."

FRG Fears Harm to Ties

LD040936 Moscow TASS in English 0914 GMT 4 Jun 87

[Text] Bonn June 4 TASS -- The violation of Soviet air space by a sport plane piloted by a West German citizen has prompted ever more serious concern in the government circles of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Local political observers note that the glee of West German politicians over the fact that Mathias Rust has been able to fly unimpeded across Soviet territory and land in the heart of Moscow has given way to anxiety that the incident may have negative consequences for relations between the FRG and the USSR.

Juergen Chrobog, a spokesman for the FRG Foreign Ministry, said Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher had realized at once how serious the affair was.

Chrobog told TASS correspondent Viktor Borodich that the minister was treating the incident very seriously and thought the West German mass media were wrong in attempting to make a joke of it.

Rust had violated Soviet air space and endangered human lives by landing in the area of Red Square, the spokesman said.

The FRG Government, he added, condemned Rust's actions and hoped that the incident would not have a negative effect on relations with the Soviet Union.

Chrobog said Soviet authorities had acted fairly in the case.

TASS VIEWS STATUS OF USSR-FRG RELATIONS

LD021657 Moscow TASS in English 1640 GMT 2 Jun 87

[Text] Bonn June 2 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Gulkin reports:

"The high contracting parties, seeking to assist stronger peace and security in Europe and all over the world..." are the words opening a historic treaty between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Precisely 15 years ago the relevant instruments of ratification were exchanged to signify its entry into force.

The principal significance of the treaty has been in sealing the principle of inviolability of the post-war borders in Europe.

Both sides declared that they had no territorial claims to any country and would not make such claims in the future.

The Soviet Union has honored its commitments unfailingly.

It is difficult to overestimate the significance of this treaty which has helped Europe take significant steps along the path of detente and formed the legal basis for easing the contradictions in the way of a normalization in the heart of the old world and for furnishing the essential prerequisite conditions for the Helsinki process.

For a number of years which have made history as the period of detente relations between statesmen, politicians and mass organizations of the USSR and the FRG and trade and economic contacts between the two countries developed successfully and cultural and scientific cooperation between them also broadened.

Lately, however, the state of things in the field has changed, not at all for the better.

"Discussions" have resumed in the FRG on revising territorial and political realities in Europe and revanchist organizations stepped up their activities with the knowledge and connivance of authorities.

Revanchists' gatherings are often attended by high-ranking representatives of the ruling coalition, including the chancellor himself.

Bonn's approach to such an important issue of the times as disarmament cannot be called constructive either. The impression is that lately it has sometimes acted as the brake in this field.

This policy has caused perplexity and concern among the people of the FRG. Realistic politicians and the democratically-minded public are for matching the lofty principles of the treaty with practical action and following a course of improvements in goodneighborly relations with the USSR, growth in cooperation and the renunciation of political anachronisms.

Improvements in relations between the USSR and the FRG are an important condition for a peaceful life of the common European home and its inhabitants.

NOVOSTI COMMENTS ON BERLIN ACCORD ANNIVERSARY

LD031042 Hamburg DPA in German 0933 GMT 3 Jun 87

[Text] Berlin (DPA) -- In the opinion of the semi-official Soviet NOVOSTI NEWS AGENCY, the possibilities of the four-power agreement on Berlin are "not used to their full extent by a long way." In a commentary on the 15th anniversary of the agreement, the news agency said the reason for this is primarily the "claims" of the Federal Republic, which are contrary to the status of the city. Bonn is transforming "the permanent residents of West Berlin virtually into hostages of sorts to its political ambitions." In the Eastern interpretation, the agreement applies only to West Berlin.

The Federal Republic is always staking claims to the "universal representation abroad of West Berlin's interests" and practices "the illegal extension of international agreements and internal laws of the FRG, concerning matters of security and status, to West Berlin."

The news agency also makes it clear that the Soviet Union does not question the "development of economic and cultural contacts between this city and the FRG." Starting form its rights and responsibilities "in relation to West Berlin, the Soviet side is seeking in a constructive spirit a settlement of the West Berlin aspect, also in the context of its relations with the Federal Republic." In this it respects the "legitimate interests of the three Western powers in this area."

'FOREIGN POLICY PLANNING' CONSULTATIONS WITH UK

LD212218 Moscow TASS in English 1926 GMT 21 May 87

[Text] London May 21 TASS -- Soviet-British consultations on questions of foreign policy planning and urgent international issues have been held here.

From the Soviet side, the consultations were held by Lev Mendelevich, member of the Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and from the British side by D. Gore-Booth, head of the Planning Department of Britain's Foreign and Commonwealth Office. Participants in the consultations met with Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs Timothy Renton.

PROBLEMS WITH CUBAN COOPERATION PROJECT AIRED

PM031129 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 87 Second Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent P. Bogomolov: "Plans by the Ocean; Journalist Raises Problem"]

[Text] Havana — Oriente — that is what Cubans call their island's eastern provinces. It is hotter here than in other regions. Population density is low but at the same time the housing shortage is more acute and the food base is inadequate. There are not enough roads or power lines. Yet beneath the ground there is a large quantity of mineral raw material, above all nonferrous metals. "In general it is our Cuban Siberia," Aleksis Mekhiya Komarron [name as transliterated], one of the leaders of the construction of the Ernesto Che Guevara nickel plant in the town of Moa, joked in his talk with me.

Surmounting Protracted Construction [subhead]

Industrialization of Oriente is one of the key tasks of Cuba's development. At the same time it is an important avenue of Soviet-Cuban cooperation. And, as in any serious matter, there are many problems here: great and small, objective and subjective, and indeed problems which they could do without. I had occasion to partially investigate their thrust during a recent working trip to the east of the republic.

The first stop on my journey was Moa municipality — or, to be more precise the Che Guevara nickel plant with a planned capacity of 30,000 tonnes a year of which over half will be supplied to the Soviet Union. Construction of the first stage of the enterprise, which is being carried out with the USSR's assistance, has entered the concluding phase. Trial output is already being produced, albeit on a modest scale, and the manufacturing "chain" is being tested.

Above the ocean, which comes right up to Moa, is the boundless blue of the sky. But veritable clouds, gray clouds, of irksome midges hover above the shops. On the other hand the notorious red dust has diminished markedly although extraction technology continues to be based on ore mining by the open-cut method.

"The air has become cleaner thanks to asphalt roads and streets. That is the result of the city's planned development," I was told by Manuel Sarmiento, first secretary of the Moa Communist Party of Cuba municipal committee. "There has also been an increase in housing — over 1,000 newcomers have acquired new housing. A residential settlement for specialists is being constructed with the USSR's assistance. Yet it all began with a few huts. How can we fail here to thank the Soviet friends who constructed with us the plant on what was virtually virgin land."

From the PRAVDA correspondents' center files: In 25 years of cooperation with the Island of Liberty, the Soviet Union has rendered assistance in creating over 50 large national economic projects. Last year alone a sugar refinery, oil refining and experimental industrial installations, 235 km of power lines, and other projects were commissioned with our aid.

And so Moa of today, well appointed and planted with greenery, does indeed gladden the eye. But something else should be mentioned: The construction of the enterprise is already in its 10th year. Unfortunately 10 years have been spent not only on effective work but also on stoppages, squabbling, and all kinds of red tape and shortcomings. The deadline for commissioning the plant has been extended twice.

"We are partly to blame here," one Soviet specialist, Igor Titov, admits self-critically. "There's no denying that there have been breakdowns and accidents at the furnaces and repeat deliveries to replace defective equipment. Sometimes there has even been a direct air link in operation but even that has not radically improved the situation. We have also had to pay repeatedly for errors in the plan, yet the plan is also ours...."

"But the plant was nonetheless constructed by Cubans. So we ourselves are to blame for many of the bottlenecks," A. Mekhiya Komarron adds. "The quality of our work has frequently left room for improvement and a number of projects have been reconstructed. Nor are our Soviet friends implicated in the instability of our collective, because of which the construction site has been ailing for years. In my view this is largely because the sociocultural and consumer services are still lagging. In addition we have also been late to introduce leading experience in creating mixed teams capable of drastically accelerating the progress of construction.

...The protracted construction which has overcast the creation of one of Cuba's largest enterprises cannot be allowed in the future at the next cooperation projects. This includes the installation of yet another nickel plant, which has been initiated at the neighboring town of Las Kamariokas [name as transliterated] with the participation of a number of CEMA countries. The interests of the Island of Liberty itself and of all the fraternal states imperiously demand that the mistakes of the past not be repeated.

"Measure Up Seven Times..." [subhead]

On leaving Moa, I go to the country's second largest city, Santiago de Cuba. An oil refinery, the Rente thermal electric power station, and other cooperation projects stand here on the very shore of the Caribbean. A little further in from the shore is an automobile repair plant constructed very recently with the USSR's assistance.

This plant is the largest of 16 similar Cuban enterprises -- even, perhaps, too large for the country. The point is, I was told by specialists, that to fully load the commissioned capacities -- 4,000 ZIL-130 automobiles a year -- broken down trucks would have to be brought here from almost all of Cuba.

In brief, GRANMA wrote recently, the impression is that the enterprise potential is far greater than the real requirements of motor transport. But only at first glance, for the plant's director, Gerardo Martin, convincingly argues the opposite: "The whole point," he notes, "is the inadequate technical standards because of which, instead of sending vehicles for capital repair, motor transport establishments prefer to make cosmetic repairs. Trucks are used to their limits and then dismantled for spare parts. It is time to elaborate a nationwide program to control the correct use of transport."

Anatoliy Boroday, leader of a group of Soviet specialists, agrees with the director: "Correct action was taken by the Cuban comrades who closed the embryonic question of the plant's reorientation. Another, entirely justified, decision was taken: to change the speciality of a similar enterprise which is still under construction in Santa Clara. And the plant in Santiago, in the opinion of our friends, could be turned into the chief center for the entire subsector, with the rights that entails. If that is what happens, the collective's output will begin to grow rapidly. So far capacities here are loaded only 27 percent."

To the plant leaders' credit, they are not succumbing to depression and are not abusing the endless references to "an excessively large project." Since the establishment has been constructed, it must be operated. But the question arises: Would it not be better to consider questions of loading it beforehand and to think together and without haste?

From the files of the PRAVDA correspondents center: In 1986 the plan for construction and installation work of cooperation projects, despite every effort, was fulfilled only 88 percent. Assimilating capacities at enterprises which have been created and bringing them to their planned capacities also lay sometimes.

Innovators Expect Support [subhead]

From Santiago de Cuba my path again lay in the direction of the island's northern coast, to the administrative center of Holguin. The cane harvester combine named for the 60th anniversary of the October revolution has been working here successfully for 10 years now. A table of the technical and economic indicators of the combines produced in various countries -- from Cuba to Australia -- hangs on the wall of the office of Anatoliy Syromyatnikov, leader of the group of Soviet specialists.

"The comparison puts us in a workmanlike mood," my interlocutor says. "You can see immediately where Holguin's output is inferior to its competitors and where it approaches the world standard. We try not to rest on our laurels although in general we have reason to be proud: The transition to the series production of the improved KTP-2 combine model has been completed.

From the files of the PRAVDA correspondents center: The more than 5,000 combines the plant has produced have made it possible to reduce the number of sugar-cane cutters by 180,000 and to mechanize about two-thirds of the harvesting. The sector's provision with modern equipment, which began 25 years ago thousands of kilometers away -- at the Lyubertsy Ukhtomskogo plant -- is now to a considerable extent ensured by Cuba itself.

"The new machine," Rolando Fernandez Ulyoa [final element of name as published], the enterprise's chief technologist, joined in the conversation, "has a more powerful engine -- not 150 but 190 horsepower. The only trouble is that these engines, produced by the Kharkov plant, include some of poor quality."

"A promising avenue," A. Syromyatnikov believes, "is the transition to the production of the KTP-3. This really will be an excellent combine not inferior to the best world models. Incidentally, we already have an experimental model."

"A good machine," is specialists' response to it. "But the plant itself cannot assimilate on its own the industrial production of all subassembly units and components. To carry out testing within the planned deadlines we will need coproduction deliveries from the USSR, of quite a high quality. Otherwise the transition to the series production of the KTP-3 will be delayed. And the present combine is becoming obsolete."

...On my return to Havana I asked Ye. Zavivalov, economic adviser at the USSR Embassy in Cuba, to impart his ideas on topical problems of cooperation in the development of the industrial base in the East of the fraternal country.

"The enterprises named in your report," he said, "have incorporated only part of the multifaceted Soviet assistance rendered to Cuba. Its principled aim is known to all: Promoting the accelerated buildup of the production forces of the island of liberty and the gradual boosting of its development level to the level of the European CEMA countries. There are indeed many difficulties here and the press is rightly noting them. At the same time it is by no means a case of problems of an 'impasse' nature, as our ideological opponent often asserts. They are problems of development, problems of growth, and they are being resolved successfully as a whole, although sometimes more slowly than we would like."

"Soviet delegations of various levels which have stayed in Cuba recently," my interlocutor continued, "have performed very fruitful work and carried out an in-depth analysis of the problems of collaboration with the leadership of a number of the republic's ministries and departments. Ahead lie coordinated efforts for the more balanced development of cooperation, the mutual amendment of a number of its avenues, and strict control over the quality and timeliness of the elaboration of the next joint projects. We need the considered, economically substantiated, creation of new enterprises including joint ones; the setting up of direct ties, above all coproduction ties, between the two countries' related labor collectives. Our collaboration tomorrow should be distinguished from today's collaboration not only by its volumes. Fewer material expenditures, the timely introduction of scientific achievements, and the growing yield from the potential which has been created — those are the criteria of modern production.

COMMENTATORS NOTE UNDERGROUND CHILEAN PUBLICATION

PY030314 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2030 GMT 2 Jun 87

[Dialogue between Radio Moscow's commentators Katiya and Pancho]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Katiya] Pancho, our listeners from Magallanes, Chile, have sent us a series of underground publications that circulate in Punta Arenas, Puerta Natales, and the entire region conveying to the workers the voice of the communists from Magallanes.

[Pancho] Well, well, how about that Katiya. And what publications are those?

[Katiya] Well, look, this is an issue of AVANCE, the mouthpiece of the regional committee of the Comunist Party of Magallanes. This issue covers the second half of April and, as is logical, carries a series of articles on the May Day celebrations. [passage omitted]

PRAVDA UKRAINY PROFILES NEW KGB CHIEF GOLUSHKO

AU010819 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 26 May 87 p 1

"A Decree of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium resolves to appoint Comrade Nikolay Mikhaylovich Golushko chairman of the Ukrainian SSR KGB.

[Signed] V. Shevchenko, chairman, and N. Khomenko, secretary of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium.

City of Kiev, 25 May 1987

Born in 1937, Comrade N.M. Golushko is a Ukrainian, a CPSU member since 1963, has a higher juridical education and the rank of Major General.

After graduating from the Tomsk State University in 1959, he worked in prosecution organs.

Since 1963, he has served in state security organs. In recent years, he has held responsible posts in the USSR KGB apparatus.

Former Chief Transfers

AU010820 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 26 May 87 p 3

[Unattributed report: "In the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium has relieved Comrade S.N. Mukha of the duties of chairman of the Ukrainian SSR KGB in connection with his transfer from active service to the reserve corps.

PRAVDA STRESSES IMPACT OF PARTY CADRES' EXAMPLE

PM031501 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 May 87 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "The Party Workers' Ethics: Using Our Entire Conduct To Convince People of the Rightness of Our Ideals"]

[Text] This theme was suggested by readers responding to PRAVDA reports about party committee first secretaries, about people entrusted with leadership. People think we should write more often and better about the party's professional personnel. Indeed, the vast majority of them possess an enhanced sense of duty to the people and display professionalism, initiative, and responsibility for their assignments. Many letters also contain reminders of another essential trait of a party leader -- his moral purity and integrity.

"Today," Hero of Socialist Labor S. Lemeschenko, chairman of Minsk Oblast's Kirov Kolkhoz, observes, "the social significance of steadfast, audacious party people ready to fight for the resolutions passed, of clever, conscientious champions and promoters of change in our society is greater than ever. [paragraph continues]

I consider Zenon Kuzmich Lomat, first secretary of Slutsk Party Gorkom, to be such a person. Apart from his energy, quick wit, and organizational abilities he is blessed with modesty, sincerity, and tact in dealing with people. His charming personality inspires people and rouses them to energetic action."

Among the problems of restructuring and cadre policy the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum listed the moral and ethical principle in party work as one of the most important and urgent issues. This is not only because the crimes of a few degenerates have cast a shadow on the honest and pure image of the Communist leader but also because the party wants to revive the spirit of Leninism, comprehensively develop democracy, and affirm publicity [glasnost] and openness [otkrytost] in our society.

The party worker's ethics. That is, his line of conduct. One could say, his line in life. How is it determined? On what does it depend? Yes, we Communists have the CPSU Program and Statutes. They contain the political and moral basis of the principles of party leadership and party relationships. However, statutory rights and obligations cannot allow for all aspects and manifestations of cadres' activity. In daily dealings with people they must be guided by definite ethical norms formulated by the CPSU throughout the course of its history.

From his first works to his last dictated notes, Vladimir Ilich provides the richest vein of advice, instructions, and wishes: on how to build the party's internal life, what the cadres' main tasks are, and what they need to master the art of leadership. Lenin urged us to struggle without restraint against red tape and bureaucracy: He was acutely and passionately opposed to communist conceit, he sternly condemned coarse and capricious behavior, he warned against administrative arrogance, and he advised us to self-critically appraise situations, not to delude ourselves with half-truths, and to be stable to acknowledge errors and put them right.

How topically the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum demands on cadres reflect Lenin's behests: "They must be models of ideological steadfastness, unswerving observance of party and state discipline, reliability, honesty, probity, incorruptibility, modesty, and intolerance of any deviation from the norms of socialist morality."

These are not merely the noble traits of character of a party leader. They may be said to constitute his political identity, to embody our principles and, in the contemporary situation, the process of society's deep democratization and the highest aims of restructuring. There is no excuse for forgetting that ordinary workers judge the firmness of the party line of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development by the secretary of the party organization, raykom, gorkom, or obkom.

Since April 1985 many energetic, thinking, selfless people have joined the leadership and taken up the cause of restructuring with responsibility and a sincere willingness. By showing high principle, giving their all, and acting effectively they are strengthening Soviet people's confidence in the party, affirming order and justice, and doing everything to galvanize the human factor.

A. Lukashkin was elected party committee secretary at a difficult time for the "Yuzhuralmashzavod". The big Orenburg enterprise was proving quite unable to overcome its laggardness. The causes lay in labor organization deficiencies and an unsuitable style of management. Director V. Ratslav relied on the force of orders in everything, humiliated his subordinates with his coarseness, and brooked no criticism of himself. [paragraph continues]

In this situation Anatoliy Georgiyevich did not yield to the "hypnotic effect of a strong personality." Securing the support of the aktiv, the young secretary put the question point-blank: The director must resolutely and once and for all abandon his unsuitable methods or give way to someone else. This attempt at persuasion did no good, and the party committe withdrew political support from the director. Nor was it easy to achieve the election of a new leader, taking the collective's views into account. Opposition came from above -- from the ministry. But here too the Communists' leader showed persistence and courage. As a result the association came to be headed by the worthy specialist A. Kobolev.

Today all party cadres are taking the test of restructuring. But unfortunately their passing rate is variable. Some cannot give up the illusion that, if they exert just a little more pressure, if they "turn the screw" just a little bit, then the situation will improve on its own. There are often cases where the party workers react badly to aktiv involvement and critical observations and regard them as "undermining" their authority. L. Khmel, a village teacher from Odessa Oblast, writes in distress to tell how B. Bondarenko, secretary of the "Avangard" Kolkhoz party committee, called her a "troublemaker" just because, in a speech at a meeting, she touched a sore point that was upsetting her fellow villagers.

Everywhere, particularly in the party environment, we must work out a style of relations, based on tolerance of others' views, mutual honesty, and truthfulness.

The party committee and each member of its staff is at the crossroads, as it were, of human fortunes. People go there with joys and sorrows, ideas and doubts, worries and complaints. Understanding people takes more than just efficiency, logic, or concrete advice. It takes cordiality, sincerity, benevolence. When personnel lack these qualities, people feel cold in their presence. Courtesy, correctness in dealing with people, obligingness, and punctuality also contribute to the art of party leadership. This applies equally to receiving callers, answering letters, and promising help.

Speech-making standards play a very important role. How incoherent some speakers sometimes are when they try to speak "without notes." Familiarity and "first-name terms" and the immoral practice of using foul language are particularly inadmissible among cadres. People who behave in this way provoke lasting personal antipathy and resentment, which reflects on the party organs that they represent.

The tasks of restructuring are complex. The time imperiously demands of cadres that they master Leninist ethic more profoundly and convince everyone of the historical and moral rectitude of communist ideals by their personal example. The brighter and purer life is in the party's own house, the sooner the country will progress to a qualitatively new level of development.

KUZNETSOV ON NEW VIEW OF DEMOCRACY'S 'HARD PROCESS'

PM040815 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 May 87 First Edition p 2

[Article by V. Kuznetsov, chief of the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Public Reception Office: "Off the Track?"]

[Text] The incident occurred at the Gorkiy V.I. Lenin Television Plant. At first everything followed its normal course. The party committee recommended that one of the workers from the collective of the chief metrologist's department be nominated as deputy to the rayon soviet. [paragraph continues]

Before the meeting the party, trade union, and Komsomol aktiv discussed possible candidates and agreed on one -- regulator A. Surchalov. So he was the person they proposed at the meeting.

But things did not go as planned. Workers in the department put forward several more candidates for consideration. They consulted one another and decided to choose engineer D. Panin. A total of 31 people voted for him. Only 16 voted for Surchalov. D. Panin was therefore nominated candidate for the position of deputy in the rayon soviet.

That would have seemed to be the end of the matter. No breach of regulations. All in strict accordance with the Law on Elections and in the spirit of the current process of renewing our democracy. However, this turn of events was not to the liking of Yu. Murunov, deputy secretary of the plant's party committee. He regarded the meeting's decision as an infringement on his own prerogatives and a scandalous act of indiscipline. Consequently, the following morning he called the totally unsuspecting candidate deputy to his office. After a long "chat" the candidate wrote out a statement to the effect that, for health reasons and because of a heavy work load in his main employment, it would not be within his powers to justify the collective's trust. Let us point out, incidentally, that D. Panin is just over 30 years old. By no means in his twilight years. He could not be called an unhealthy man.

But opting out is opting out. Another meeting was called. Then, so that people did not bring up anything unforeseen, party committee instructor Ye. Solomin was sent to the "disobedient" collective. Judging by what he said at the meeting, his ideas on democracy are very hazy but, on the other hand, he knew very well that he could not disobey his boss. So he managed to press-gang them into a meeting at which only one candidate -- A. Surchalov -- was considered. A total of 33 people voted for him, against 17 abstentions and 10 who did not vote at all.

The party committee breathed a sigh of relief, but to this day people in the department are still debating over what happened.

"We are told this is the evolved practice, the practice of nominating people recommended 'from above.'" A. Filippov, chief of one of the department's design bureaus, said. "But is it a good thing? Our soviets are not very efficient. Everyone knows this. Surely the reason for their poor work is that a certain percentage of workers, management, young people and women are nominated at meetings to 'make up the number,' without too much concern being shown for their practical qualities. The main thing is to maintain the 'pattern.' If you don't fit into this 'pattern,' even if you are worthy of it three times over, you will not be nominated as a candidate. It is absurd!..."

He is backed up by engineer L. Nebolsina:

"We have seen enough of how deputies work in our rayon and we have reached the discomforting conclusion that they work badly. We need honest, conscientious people. People like Penin. It is not at all important which category they fall into -- engineer or worker. What is important is their ability to act. But for this to happen deputies must be clearly aware that they are elected and not appointed...."

Yu. Murunov, deputy secretary of the plant's party committee, has a quite different opinion. He has his own ideas on democracy.

"I was deeply disturbed by what happened in the chief metrologist's department," he said with conviction. [paragraph continues]

"I. Sizova, secretary of the party bureau, did a poor job of conveying the aktiv's decision to the labor collective and failed to do everything possible to ensure that a person was put forward whose nomination had been agreed by the party committee or was of equivalent standing. But this was my fault really," he said in self-criticism. "I did not make sure that my instructions were carried through. The meeting went off the track as a result."

These were his actual words: "went off the track." That is, he did not admit the possibility of tracks' existing other than the one into which all his ideas on democracy fit. Or, to be more precise, the "do as I say" track. Perhaps other ideas would have occurred to Murunov, of course, had the relevant instructions been issued. He even complained with heartfelt simplicity:

"There is all this talk of democracy, but I have had no recommendations as to what this really entails. How is one to act in this kind of situation? As an organizer, things are not very clear."

The man cannot go one step without instructions "from above," which he would like to have for every occasion in life. What is to be done? He is to be both blamed and pitied. He has not been taught to be independent or to think and make decisions. He has been taught to carry out instructions.

There is only one solution -- there must be more democracy, so that people may breathe in its bracing air once, twice, three times and then look around them with new eyes, lost in thought. A hard, painful process, but they will begin to change.

TV PANEL ANALYZES REFORM, PERSONALITY CULTS

LD301155 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1515 GMT 28 May 87

["Questions of Theory" program moderated by Vasiliy Nikolayevich Kuznetsov, candidate of philosophical sciences; with Academician Teodor Ilich Oyzerman; Sergey Vladimirovich Kolesnikov, deputy editor-in-chief of the journal KOMMUNIST; Professor Eduard Aleksandrovich Bagramov, doctor of philosophical sciences; Tatyana Aleksandrovna Filakova, a tutor at the Political Education Center of Moscow Gorkom and Moscow Oblispolkom; and Yelena Sergeyevna Mednova, chief of the group of lecturers at the Marx and Engels museum; discussion takes place at Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels Museum in Moscow; date not given -- recorded]

[Excerpts] [Kuznetsov] To begin our discussion, let us ask Academician Teodor Ilich Oyzerman to give us his thoughts about the role of philosophy and the social sciences in general in the shaping of new economic and political thinking.

[Oyzerman] You will know, Comrades, that the Central Committee's political report to the 27th party congress noted the responsibility of social scientists, including philosophers, for the slowdown in the pace of social and economic development which occurred in our country in the last 2 decades. When it is said that philosophers -- and economists as well, I might add -- go in for scholastic logomachy, the philosopher and economist do not sometimes quite understand what that means. Yet the reproach is quite justifiable. For what was the principal feature of scholasticism? Scholasticism proceeded on the premise that the truth was already known, that it was inscribed in holy writ and that the idea was to elucidate and interpret this truth and to make it accord with other, similarly established truths.

That is why the main form of scholastic work was the commentary. In science, however, the idea is not just to elucidate truths that have already been discovered, but to reveal the truth. A researcher beginning his work can never say what results he will arrive at, but if he knows the result in advance, what sort of researcher is he?

The second point I want to discuss is the divorce from the vital problems and needs of the life of society. Again there is a certain bewilderment here on the part of many social scientists. If you look at the topics of dissertations, the majority of them are devoted to the contradictions of the development of socialist society, public ownership of the means of production, the relations among socialist nations, criticism and self-criticism and socialist competition -- I won't give you the whole list. Every topic of socialist reality has been reflected in dissertations, books, and articles of one sort or another.

Nevertheless, there really is a divorce, a real divorce from vital issues, and what it amounts to is not that these issues were not discussed, but that these questions were discussed uncritically. Science is altogether unthinkable without a critical approach to reality. With us, social scientists, there was what I would call obeisance to current practice, practice that should have been critically probed.

The party has criticized the improper practice of high-expenditure technology, and the improper practice of calculating labor productivity appears to increase. The party has criticized the so-called residual principle in making budget allocations: for instance, the social sphere, which is almost everything in people's lives, received only the funds that remained from spending on, say, heavy industry or other things that were seen as taking priority. Is it not altogether a dogma of our economists that the priority development of the means of production, not the social sphere, is the indicator of progress? What is the social sphere? It is the development of man, and man is the main productive force. That is how I see the shortcomings in our work. I began with them because in light of these shortcomings we can self-critically reply to other questions and also see our task more clearly. [passage omitted]

[Andrey Leshchikov, from audience] How can you explain the current high level of interest in questions of history, and what in your view is the role of history in the present process of reforming our society?

[Kolesnikov] Historians and scholars today face a task of vast significance and enormous importance. It is to write works that adequately reflect the processes that have taken place in our society and reveal the roots of those phenomena, those negative phenomena, that we are confronting today. The braking mechanism that was discussed at the January Plenum did not emerge all at once. It has quite definite historical roots and it is very important to find out from where and how all this came about, what the source of it was. The point is that there are still many blank spots in our 70-year history, there are many as yet undescribed events, events and situations that have not as yet been analyzed well or in sufficient depth. Our history is not as yet sufficiently populated with its real protagonists, with people.

[Bagramov] I do not think that when we speak of a social brake we can name any particular classes or broad sections of society that really have an interest in this. Yet, of course, conservatism has its social and psychological causes. It cannot be linked to age, as people sometimes link it, because conservatives do not have to be elderly people. However, this psychological mechanism and its roots nevertheless need to be researched.

[A.V. Tuvin, from audience] Academician Oyzerman said that the social sciences had marked time for almost 20 years. I would like to know the main reasons for this stagnant phenomenon.

[Oyzerman] What was the cause? It was to a considerable degree of course caused by the situation that reigned within the country. You look to me to be of the generation of people who took the brief course in party history and studied the fourth chapter, second paragraph, which was a popular, simplified account of dialectical historical materialism. This account, which was highly simplified by comparison with the classic works of Marxism, was regarded and officially approved from above, as a canon, as a model on which philosophy text books should be based and propaganda work conducted, and everything else, if you said anything else was called expressing personal views [otsebyatina]. [passage omitted]

In 1939, on the instructions of I forget whom, I traveled to Polotsk to give a lecture on the philosophy part of the brief course. After the lecture, the raykom secretary, who had chaired the meeting, asked: What do you think, Comrade Oyzerman, will there be contradictions under communism? Without even pausing for thought, so to speak, I said: It goes without saying that there will, but they will be qualitatively different contradictions from those in a class society, contradictions between the old and the new.

Well, I can't say I gave a very substantive reply. I was a post-graduate student then and there was much I did not myself understand. But after that, I should add, I was called in by the senior secretary of the journal BOLSHEVIK, as KOMMUNIST was called then. He called me into the journal's offices, and said: A letter has come about you, saying that you are going around expressing personal views. I said: [words indistinct] I am expressing the Marxist viewpoint. He said: I can see that. There are no personal views here. He added: Please reply to this person.

I wrote a reply, the editorial office signed it as if it were its own reply, of course, and there the matter ended. But I must say that this to some degree made an overwhelming impression on me. I'm no timid person and I can say that even after that I expressed my own opinion on all sorts of things. But nevertheless, that atmosphere that existed, that was cultivated because of the so-called Stalin personality cult -- and the expression personality cult does not adequately convey that whole historical situation -- all this of course led to the stagnation in philosophy and the science of economics.

Remember Stalin's writing, his last writing, where he tried to demonstrate that it was time to go over to direct production exchange? Of course that led economic thinking in absolutely the wrong direction. Nonetheless, I think the philosophers are at fault, because the feature of philosophy, you know, is that philosophy is, as it were, the consciousness of one's historical age. The only real philsopher -- as opposed to simply a propagandist, a teacher, a professor, or an academician -- is the real philosopher, in the true sense of the word, who shows historical initiative in the way he raises fundamental questions of theory. That was what did not exist, and that is why there were no real philosophers.

[Bagramov] If you don't mind, I will continue that idea and say that I think an absence of boldness on the part of our researchers also had an effect here; in other words there is the subjective factor. We should recall Marx and Engels' reference to the author of the Divine Comedy when they said about science that at the entrance to science, like at the entrance to Hell, there should be written the demand: Here the heart must be firm.

Here fear must not give counsel. In science there have been many people who played it safe, people who interpreted things in light of what was advantageous or convenient at the time. That led to consequences we are all aware of.

Continuing on with Teodor Ilich's idea, I would like to touch on an important sphere of our research, and one that Mikhail Sergeyevich made special mention of, incidentally, at the January plenum: the sphere of relations among the nationalities. It would appear that assertions about harmony, full bloom, drawing closer together, and the absence of any contradictions, at all have not penetrated any science, or any single branch of the social sciences, as much as they have the theory, our theory, of the relations among the nationalities. Here, too, doctrinaire views and uncritical dogmatism were in evidence. Instead of analyzing the real processes in social life, you will remember, scholars concentrated chiefly on giving definitions to the term nation and to the question of the future of languages.

Truths were endlessly repeated, correct, perhaps, in themselves about the drawing closer together and the flowering of nations, but beyond the bounds of those processes nothing was seen. In other words, instead of an analysis, a bold analysis, of the causes, for example, of nationalist or chauvinist prejudices, instead of an analysis of why narrow local interests were being pursued, we -- if not all of us academics, then at least a certain proportion of us -- essentially presented real events in an exclusively rosy light.

Then events such as those in Alma-Ata occurred. We have to face the real processes head on. We really must study things and make the relevant conclusions and help the party in its enormous creative work. In the second place, we simply must be more bold in our scientific research. Every academic should have the right, in my view, to make a mistake. He may make a mistake, but that doesn't mean that he will be persecuted. The party long ago, I think, condemned the methods once used in that regard. It now must be done more boldly and there are, incidentally, at a time of the democratization of social life, all the conditions whereby an academic searching for the truth should be given support, both by his collective and by the party as a whole.

[Irina Machulskaya, member of audience] Is there any danger that there will be a return to what happened in the sixties -- the nullification of what is happening today, all our progressive undertakings? Because they are being very strongly resisted by various people, perhaps consciously and perhaps not, but all the same there is resistance. What do you think? You have lived through all this. So I am asking you as members of the older generation.

[Bagramov] Progress in social life is not only, of course, a continuous path from one success to another. The guarantee, you know, of not returning to the negative phenomena you spoke of lies within us. It lies in the degree of social activity we show and the degree of democratization the party is carrying out that we will support and actively implement. So, no one can give us any recipes for the course that our own activity will take. But my view now is that the current movement and the strong trends in society that I think are now becoming more and more decisive are irreversible.

[Machulskaya] In this context, a question: What do you think, shouldn't we study in greater detail the 20-year period or 15-year period that we have been speaking about and cover all the bases? Why do we speak only of the Stalin personality cult? Why don't we speak of the Brezhnev personality cult?

Why don't we speak of the Khrushchev personality cult? I think that without making a further detailed and concrete study of that period and without pinpointing the reasons which led to that stagnation, we simply won't be able to move forward.

[Bagramov] What I can say is that in the Institute of Marxism-Leninism a multi volume history of the CPSU has been and still is in preparation. As far as I know -- although I specialize more in philosophy and scientific communism -- there has been a quite well-qualified discussion of sample copies of the volumes covering the period you mentioned. Those sample copies were not passed for publication. Quite sharp criticism was made that obliged both our historians and other historians to review it and, in accordance with the guidelines that the party is now providing, to make a proper evaluation, based on the archives and the truth of life, of all the periods. There should, of course, be no excesses in that direction and we will not permit them, but there must be a scientific, Marxist-Leninist, party position. Your suggestion in that regard will, I think, be received with great enthusiasm by the academics in the Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

[Viktor Semenikhin, member of audience] How does contemporary philosophy, Marxism-Leninism, explain the recurring nature of these phenomena, the fact that they are not one time phenomena, but recur? How can philosophy explain that under socialism phenomena of stagnation periodically recur?

[Oyzerman] In my view, there was no Khrushchev cult, and there was no Brezhnev cult. There was a violation of collegiate leadership and, so to speak, an exceeding of the level of power that should be given to a leader. I stress this because when we speak of Stalin's personality cult, there was a particular popular sentiment, you see, faith and conviction, and there was no hypocrisy about it. When people wrote of Stalin as their "father" and went to battle with his name of their lips, it was sincere. When Stalin died, my wife asked me in tears how we could live without him. Well, I was a more sober-minded person and told her: It's all right, we'll manage somehow!

[Bagramov] Now you're even more sober-minded, aren't you! [laughter among audience]

[Oyzerman] Yes, that's right, I'm even more sober-minded! So it would be proper to speak of the personality cult of Khrushchev or Brezhnev. It would be proper to say simply our society was not democratic enough and now we are struggling for full socialist democracy. To your question I would also like to add that the current reform, which we call radical -- and moreover we saw that the revolution is continuing -- is qualitatively different from the attempts at reform started in the sixties. I remember that time well and I remember chiefly the economic measures that were planned, while here we have radical measures being planned and implemented in all areas of social life. The fact that they are being implemented in a struggle against the old ways is completely natural. There's no need to be afraid of it, and you must not see in it anything that will stop the reform. It's simply that we are accustomed to some sort of sentimental idea about the struggle between the old and the new under socialism.

First of all, our thinking was that the old was left over from capitalism: the accursed past against which a fight to the death had to be waged. But what we have now is that under socialism something old has appeared. People used to tend to describe those bad, now there is something different. So the way it turned out was that the struggle between old and new was a struggle between good and better. But no, excuse me, I think differently.

The struggle between old and new that is being waged now is a struggle between the conservative and the progressive, regardless of the fact that the conservative was formed under conditions of socialism.

[Semenikhin] In that case, I've got this question: What was the chief reason why the economic reform of 1965 did not succeed and was stalled in implementation?

[Oyzerman] I personally find it difficult to say what precisely was the chief reason. All I remember is a number of aspects of that reform that even at the time seemed fairly questionable. I am deeply convinced that at that time what we needed was comprehensive reform; not just a reform of the economic mechanism, but a reform of the social mechanism as well. There is a concept that is broader than that of the economic mechanism: there is the social mechanism, which embraces the whole sphere of people's activity, including their education and so forth. [passage omitted]

MOSCOW NEWS READERS JOIN 'REAL HISTORY' DEBATE

PM031607 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 21, 24 May 87 p 2

[Reader's letters under the rubric "Letters to the Editor": "History and Our Time" -- first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] In our issue No 19 we printed a letter from a group of historians who criticized the speech of Yuriy Afanasyev, rector of the Moscow State Institute of Historian-Archivists, published previously in this newspaper (No 2). Readers have responded to this publication -- part of their comments is featured in this issue. We apologize in advance to their authors: there have been many letters and, desiring to give a fuller picture of differing opinions, we had to make some cuts without altering, of course, the substance of their position.

I would like to bring forth my considerations of the historians' letter. I think that the newspaper did a good job, having printed this document without any changes. It in itself bears fairly eloquent witness to the low cultural level and elementary incompetence of the authors, their hard and dried dogmatism and obvious inability to grasp the elements of the new mentality which is so essential in our time. But judging by their posts, these people are in charge of chairs at higher educational establishments and must be at the head of the process of teaching students. It is easy to imagine that their lectures evoke neither interest nor trust among the students.

I fully agree with Yuriy Afanasyev's stance and the main principle: to carry out the reconstruction in real earnest, there is a need to tell the whole truth about our country's past.

However, the historians' letter gives food for thought: if the level of rank-and-file teachers of the CPSU's history is the same as that of the comrades who signed the letter, if they teach young people thoughtlessly to accept dogmas and give up the search for new approaches and forms of mentality, comprising the meaning and spirit of the 27th CPSU Congress, how then will these young people be able to realize the need for revolutionary reconstruction and join the process of its materialization?

Yuriy Lisovskiy,

D. Sc. (History), senior research associate, Institute of the International Working-Class Movement, USSR Academy of Sciences.

Yuriy Afanasyev's article amounts to a fruit of scientific ignorance and cheap demagoguery. There are historians who specialize in different disciplines: ancient history, the Middle Ages, universal history, history of the CPSU and history of the USSR. I have not seen the name of Afanasyev among the Soviet experts on the history of the USSR and the history of the CPSU or among ranking specialists in problems raised by the author. The author got down to problems in which he is simply incompetent. Voluntarily or not, he is playing into the hands of bourgeois historiography....

In my letter to you I set forth not only my personal opinion, but also that of my colleagues in the chair of the institute where I work, several scholars of the M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, and other Moscow institutes, leading specialists in problems raised in the article, veterans of the Party, and members of the Scientific-Methodological Council of the historical section of the Moscow Regional Department of the Znaniye (Knowledge) Society. The opinion of all the comrades, whom I happened to meet with and discuss these problems of late, is unanimous -- the authors and editors of the newspapers made serious mistakes by tackling a job which is beyond their competence and then carrying it out very unprofessionally. I believe that the newspaper must be more circumspect in selecting and elucidating material on problems of the Party-history science, after corresponding consultations with specialists. Some other materials, published in the newspaper of late, also deserve criticism in this respect.

As to Yu. Afanasyev's article-reply "Talking about the past, we must keep the future of socialism in mind", it is so petty and clamorous that it merits no special consideration. The attempts to draw us into discussions about the past can divert us from the tasks of the reconstruction which the Party set at its 27th Congress and arrest whatever must be decided and done today.

Anatoliy Borisov, Cand. Sc. (History) Assistant professor, member of the CPSU since 1947, veteran of the Great Patriotic War.

I wholly support the contributions by Yu. Afanasyev and would like to express a piece of my mind (I am a worker and have been a member of the CPSU for over 40 years) to the esteemed comrade historian scholars with whom I disagree in their opinion on the development of the historical science in our country.

It is not during the past 15 to 20 years, but during the past 20 to 30 years that historians' impulse began to run low, and in the past 20 years that it damped down altogether. Why? Soviet people are looking forward for an answer to this far from easy question from historians. The people want to know the truth about what we had not only during the postwar years, but during the 70 years of Soviet power. We need not verbiage, but the truth. The truth about the times of the rule of Stalin, Khrushchev and especially Brezhnev. How it all was and what happened, why we failed to stop the negative blunders in time, why we kept silent? Why our shortcomings and negative phenomena were spoken about straightforwardly and frankly only at the 27th Congress? Yuriy Afanasyev is right. We have no real manuals on the history of the Party and the history of the USSR. We also need the truth about the Great Patriotic War and the role of personalities (leaders) in that war. Dear Comrades: doesn't it seem to you that what you are doing is not reconstruction but only tuning up for it? Or are you too old for that? Enough of unnecessary discussions. It is time to get down to serious work which we, worker communists, are expecting from you. We need the truth and nothing but the truth, because without it there can be no real history of the country, the Party and the people.

I. Khudyakov, Monchegorsk, Murmansk Region.

I am neither a doctor nor a candidate of science -- just an ordinary reader. But I would not like to study history according to Yu. Afanasyev. He is too emotional and his class stance is too blunted. The history of the human race is a history of the class struggle in all its manifestations. Political struggle -- according to Vladimir Ilich Lenin -- inevitably brings the opponents apart to the extreme positions. Peaceful discussion clubs in periods of historical cataclysms are a utopia.

Upon reading Yu. Afanasyev's article, the following question arises -- why does the author accentuate the earlier period of the USSR precisely now? It would seem that at present the paramount task of a historian is to grasp the reasons of the 20 years of stagnation and to give a class assessment to these phenomena. The task now is to understand what has happened in the country since the mid-1950s and why bureaucracy flourished so abundantly. Instead, the accent is made on the mistakes of the Concise Course of the History of the Party. Incidentally, this course has not been used in the past 35 years either at the secondary and higher school or in political classes. But stagnation took place precisely in the past 20 years. No answer is given to this main question.

Fomin, Moscow

At a time when a patently unfavourable situation has taken shape in the social sciences, when stagnation phenomena have arisen in the development of theoretical thought and there is a shortage of the truth in teaching the history of the CPSU and other social sciences, the authors of the letter in opposition to Yu. Afanasyev peremptorily claim that in the late 1960s and early 1970s there appeared "some very outstanding scientific works" and exaltedly speak on this basis about "an ascent to new heights in historical science". We shall not dwell on a concrete assessment of the works mentioned in the letter. We shall only note that, as we see it, the stance of the four authors (willy-nilly) affords a cogent example of the manifestation of the ideology and psychology of stagnation, which was spoken about at the January 1987 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee. We believe it is also appropriate in this context to recall the assessment of these phenomena given at a recent conference of social scientists at the USSR Academy of Sciences. As well all know, it correctly pointed out that negative phenomena and stagnation were to a certain extent a consequence of dogmatism, of concepts severed from life, and dead schemes. The point at issue is, of course, the need for a scientific analysis of the historical past.

The authors of the article have a right, of course, to set forth their personal point of view on the question they touch upon. However, they mention their posts, which may produce the impression that their stance is also shared by members of the chairs at which they work.

In this context it must be said quite categorically that Professor L. Shirikov, one of the authors of the letter, expresses solely his personal point of view, which the CPSU History Chair of the Academy of Social Sciences at the CPSU Central Committee does not share.

Professors V. Ivanov, G. Petryakov, N. Romanovskiy, CPSU History Chair, Academy of Social Sciences at the CPSU Central Committee.

ACADEMICIAN LINKS SCIENCES, NEW THINKING, 'GLASNOST'

WA011500 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 18, 11 May 87 pp 18-21

[Academician Vitaliy Goldanskiy article in "Reflections" column: "Science and New Thinking"]

[Text] It is common knowledge that in the context of the mid-20th-century scientific and technological revolution science possesses a colossal potential for both construction and destruction. Everything depends on how science is used. But if only a few decades ago it was regarded with respect bordering on awe, if many saw it as something of a panacea for the ills besetting mankind, today the opposite view — that science is the source of all evil — is becoming more and more prevalent.

Indeed, we are witnessing scientific achievements that have radically affected the conditions of human existence, all aspects of our life (material and hence spiritual). Here I would like to underscore that not enough light has been thrown on the important contribution modern science, scientific and technological progress is making to the theoretical substantiation of the new thinking that is asserting itself in both the foreign policy (avenues to a nuclear-free world) and the domestic policy (democratization and openness) of the CPSU and our country. In other words, the new thinking is pivoted not on illusory notions, it is dictated not by arbitrariness, but by a strictly scientific, realistic approach to the conditions of human existence today, by a thorough appraisal of all the factors of scientific and technological progress. It is a concrete, theoretically substantiated policy, the product of the present stage in the development of society, science and technology.

Nuclear super-armament has brought the world to the dangerous point where the very existence of humanity is threatened. It has become clear that with the nuclear weaponry accumulated to date, any global war, should it break out, would inevitably develop into a nuclear war. Even an "ordinary" armed conflict in this age of nuclear power production could lead to massive casualties through radiation caused by the damage done to nuclear reactors.

Extremely rapid is the development of devices for keeping track of everything that is being done on our planet (and often also underwater or underground) from outer space by means of spy satellites equipped with all manner of sensors. The earth, our common home, is thus wide open to surveillance by an all-seeing eye looking down from space. For instance, figures on licence plates are clearly visible on photographs taken from an altitude of hundreds of kilometres. At the same time, mastery of outer space and possession of the latest means of surveillance, in a word, the level attained by information science, have afforded radically new opportunities for the strictest mutual verification of the observance of all international agreements. Such verification can and should be the guarantee of the establishment of mutual trust, a reliable obstacle to the drifting of humanity not only to nuclear war but to wars fought with conventional armaments. In the present conditions created by scientific and technological progress any repetition of what happened on June 22, 1941, when the colossal nazi war machine suddenly pounced on our country, is totally excluded.

Under the impact of scientific and technological progress on international politics, the dogmatic assertion that a nuclear holocaust can bring victory (or defeat) to one or another social system has given way to the realization that in a nuclear war there can be no victors. People are coming to see that nuclear war is tantamount to the self-destruction of human civilization. Lenin's thesis that human values take priority over the objectives of one or another class has found new emphatic confirmation. Hence the totally new approach to foreign policy issues that is reflected in many of our programme documents.

But if realization of the implications of such factors as nuclear super-armament and the possibility of comprehensive verification argues in favour of Soviet foreign policy, of our programme of "disarmament for development" (the antipode of "armament instead of development"), the extraordinary progress in information science and computerization, in the means of global communication and the extensive use of outer space has logically led to another, internal political aspect of the new thinking. It offers further scientific confirmation of the need for democratization and openness which naturally follow from Marxism, the only possible and rational foundation of socialist society.

Being a stimulator and the material basis of democratization and openness, the scientific and technological revolution brings out in still bolder relief the advantages of socialism. Let us examine this more closely in the light primarily of the specific character and tasks of science.

What, it may be asked, is the most characteristic feature of our time -- this time of unprecedented progress in electronics, computerization, space exploration and rapid advance of science in general?

Above all, there is the ever-mounting influx of information, its increasing range, volume and the speed of disseminating, the sophistication of the means of data recording, storing and transfer. Take, for instance, such basic features of modern computers and other data systems as memory and speed (already in the offing are ultra-modern molecular computers, which will break all records for concentration of information per unit of volume), the ever-increasing quantity of information sources -- periodicals, books and scientific articles. Terms like "indexing," "key words," "automated data-processing" are becoming more and more common.

The advent of diverse data banks with automated inlet and outlet terminals marks a breakthrough in international information and communication. International radio broadcasting is gradually being relegated to the background by international space television. More and more widely used (so far mainly in the West) are personal computers. Distinguished by their data storage capacity and versatility, they are -- and this is of no little importance -- becoming data duplicators as well. Colossal as it is, their memory keeps expanding, the network of their links with other data banks is becoming increasingly ramified and intricate. Computer languages, such as Algol and Fortran, are developing into a sort of latter-day Esperanto.

Worldwide radio and television transmission in these machine languages, their reception by personal computers and programmed data processing are undoubtedly a matter of the foreseeable future.

Whether this is "good" or "bad," whether we should praise or blame science for all this is beside the point. All this is a fact of life, an inseparable feature of our time, the time we live in, a reality that has to be reckoned with, by which we have to be guided if we are not to lag hopelessly behind the times not only technically but also in our thinking.

And here, in my view, it is necessary to make full use of that vast potential of socialist society which for so many years was virtually forgotten and which now has been brought to the fore -- democratization and openness.

There are, then, two options. On the one hand, democratization and openness, and on the other, walling oneself off from information, wearing blinkers, building bigger, thicker, higher fences. Clearly, only the first of these alternatives, the one the Party is advocating, is in step with scientific and technological progress, moreover is

based on that progress, and gives maximum impetus to further advance of science and technology whereas the latter is an impediment to, a brake on progress.

In socialist society, people must be well-informed, must have the maximum information at their disposal. This thesis is based on deep faith in the unlimited opportunities socialist society affords for the flowering of the human personality. Otherwise propaganda threatens to become inept and dull, invariably belated, its arguments threadbare and outdated, designed to combat not the real, strong opponent but a mythical dull-witted adversary, and as often as not, with the exclusion of the strongest and most incisive facts from our own arsenal, facts which for one reason or another the pseudo-propagandist prefers to conceal.

Openness plays an enormous role also in ensuring an effective feedback in terms of truly scientific sociological analysis of the response, the reaction of the people to the initiatives of the Party and the government, to world developments. What we need is not nebulous wishful thinking, not the thunderous echoes of self-congratulatory exhortations and success-reports, but honest, objective and impartial analysis of everything that is happening around us.

"Our strength," Lenin said, "lies in stating the truth!" It is this conviction that enabled us to admit openly and honestly from the rostrum of a recent plenary meeting of the Central Committee that "serious shortcomings in ideological and political educational work were in many cases covered up by the staging of showy campaigns and events, by numerous jubilee celebrations both in the centre and in the localities" with the result that "the world of everyday realities and the world of ostentatious well-being moved farther and farther apart."

It is precisely because our restructuring is based on a strictly scientific foundation and not on mere whim, because it is a clear-cut, theoretically substantiated programme of action that it causes undisguised alarm among anti-Soviet circles in the West. The policy of democratization and openness has knocked the ground from under the feet of the diverse radio "voices" and press hacks. They have been left with nothing but futile crystal gazing. The most sensational cooked-up "facts," often accompanied by fantastic commentaries, cannot interest readers and listeners nearly as much as the true picture of life in our country, of the people and the world at large presented by our journals, newspapers, radio and television programmes. That is why the purveyors of anti-Soviet propaganda are far more anxious than anyone else to undermine the Party's policy of democratization and openness, to halt, retard, reverse the process of renewal. They are seriously alarmed at the sharp decline, despite the fact that the BBC is no longer jammed, in the number of listeners to the various "voices." Why spend money on jamming when openness has proved much more effective.

Today there is a clearly defined demarcation line between those who welcome our reforms, who are interested in strengthening relations with our country and in building world peace and those who would like to exhaust the U.S.S.R. economically, through the arms race in the hope of compelling us to take steps damaging to the economy and to the constructive tasks of building socialism. The restructuring has become something of a touchstone also for former Soviet citizens who have chosen to leave their native land. The renewal in our country is opposed (not surprisingly) both by the so-called "conservatives" among them, the votaries of the old order, and by those who until recently posed as ultra-innovators. Both categories are now bringing grist to one and the same mill.

Incidentally, lack of information played into the hands of the foreign purveyors of lying propaganda. No small role was played here also by the striving inherent in the bureaucratic mentality to grow as many forbidden fruits as possible. One cannot but recall in this connection the excellent definition of bureaucracy given at the

beginning of this century by the German Chancellor Prince von Bulow. "Bureaucracy," he wrote, "is always behind with needed reforms, is distinguished by the extreme narrowness of its aspirations, suffers from political clumsiness and displays a constant tendency to interfere in the personal lives of citizens. By its policy of pinpricks it only irritates the population to no purpose and creates the soil for opposition."

Nothing can be more instructive for those who drool with pleasure at the thought of the West than to see with their own eyes the foreign lands "flowing with milk and honey" and to experience themselves the much-vaunted "freedoms" and the crime, unemployment and social inequality that are rife in their shadow. As for those who are aching to leave their native land, it is probably time to say "good riddance." And to advise them, before they go, to take another look at the American TV film about Soviet citizens shown recently on Soviet television.

A few words about history. It seems to me that our historical science lags far behind literature and the arts in depicting the heroic and tragic pages in the history of our country and our Party. History cannot be seriously studied or taught without access to original source material. I have always been keenly interested in history, and indeed I wanted to become a historian. Knowing this, an American colleague of mine once presented me with a book entitled "Page One," a collection of facsimile reproductions of the most important front pages of THE NEW YORK TIMES for the years 1920-75. A fascinating and instructive book! It clearly revealed, for instance, how disproportionately little coverage was given in the United States to the decisive contribution made by the Soviet armed forces to the defeat of nazi Germany. Would it not be in place for us to have a similar book?

The files of many of our newspapers and journals are well-nigh crumbling with age, and libraries are now reluctant to lend them out. Here is where a book like "Page One" would come in very handy. The stenographic reports of congresses, too, are not easily available. It is difficult to overestimate the tremendous educational value these living pages of history could have for the youth. And how instructive a warning would be the republication of the stenographic record of the August 1948 session of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Agriculture Sciences which branded genetics as a "pseudoscience" and set the development of Soviet biology back decades.

But to return from history to the events of the past year. There are some "know-alls" who keep count of all its disasters -- Chernobyl and the Admiral Nakhimov, the loss of the atomic submarine, the coal mine explosion, and the avalanches -- and see them as proof that if anything has changed in our country it is for the worse. No, it is not that there are more disasters, but that there is more honest and frank information about them and, had there been such openness before, there would be less negligence and fewer disasters today.

Unfortunately, we did not give enough thought to the great harm wrought by the habitual absence of openness. Until recently, we never carried reports of preparations for our space flights (apart from the international ones), although such preparations are clearly visible from outer space. Our seismological stations never included in the list of their observations the underground testing of nuclear weapons in the U.S.S.R. (which were reported by the seismological stations of other countries), and this gave us, the present writer included, no little trouble during discussions of the problem of the total banning of nuclear testing at various international meetings. Today, after the more than 18 months of the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear testing -- that striking manifestation of our new thinking -- and after the joint Soviet-American seismic experiment in the area of our testing ground new Semipalatinsk, the voices of our ill-wishers have fallen silent. One more proof that openness is a powerful factor making for a healthier international climate.

The policy of democratization and openness, proclaimed by the 27th Congress of the CPSU and emphatically confirmed by the January (1987) plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee as the cardinal element of restructuring and renewal, is firmly based not only on the fundamental principles of socialist society, but also on analysis of the basic trends of scientific and technological progress.

The active builder of our future cannot but be conscious of the identity of his own interests with the interests of the socialist homeland, its welfare and prosperity, be it a matter of the national economy or the environment, history or cultural monuments. At the same time, he must think independently, be able to tell what is in question -- just one more "order" from above or the supreme interests of the country. It is of the utmost importance that Soviet people be fully informed, that they be supplied with the maximum information systematized and thoroughly analyzed. And when people come to realize that it is precisely science that has fully substantiated the vital need both for a nuclear-free world and for a socialist society built on the principles of democratization and openness, restructuring and renewal, then -- I am firmly convinced! -- there will be not the slighest room for even a shadow of doubt as to whether science is a blessing or a disaster for humanity.

BRIEFS

NEW PERSONAL COMPUTER -- Moscow May 29 TASS -- The Soviet Union has designed a new personal computer, "ES-18410," as part of the programme for computer science development in socialist countries. The programme unites Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, Romania and Cuba. The mathematical software of the "ES-18410" computer, equal to similar Western computers, is compatible with world standards. The "ES-18410" has the on-line memory of one megabyte. The computer will be the basic one for the production of personal computers in the Soviet Union. The computer science development programme envisages the development within the next five-ten years of the general-purpose computer, as well as personal, small and super computers which will quickly perform several billion operations a second. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1211 GMT 29 May 87 LD]

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA EDITORIAL ON RESPONSIBILITY

PM031737 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Jun 87 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Responsibility for the Assigned Task"]

[Text] ...Just over a year ago, Guards Colonel V. Lesnov was appointed commander of the "N" Guards Tank Regiment, which ranked among the laggards then. A professionally trained and demanding officer, a sound organizer and educator who relied skillfully on the party organization, he got down to work energetically, with a sense of lofty responsibility. In line with the demands of restructuring, he himself joined in the work and inspired others to do the same by means of his personal example. The unit is now one of the best in the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany in terms of combat training standards, discipline, and organization.

...This happened a few years ago on our southern borders. A foreign military aircraft intruded into the Soviet Union's airspace. The order to stop the incursion was given to Military Pilot 1st Class Guards Captain V. Kulyapin. He performed the task. The pilot was awarded the order of the Red Banner for the skill, fortitude, and resolve he displayed during the critical moments. Valentin Aleksandrovich Kulypin is now a lieutenant colonel and political worker. His daily actions confirm his loyalty to duty and his lofty personal responsibility for the assigned task.

Just two instances from our army life. Different in nature and occurring at different times. But there is much in common that links the officers involved. Primarily, it is loyalty to duty and lofty personal responsibility for the assigned task, for the reliable defense of the fatherland. This responsibility is based on ardent Soviet patriotism, communist ideological commitment, loyalty to the military oath, and readiness to perform the set task and devote all strength, energy, and knowledge to the assigned work under any circumstances, no matter how difficult this may be.

These very important qualities of our commanders and political workers, inherited by them from the older generations of military cadres and primarily from the frontline fighters and heroes of the Great Patriotic War, acquire special importance today. Restructuring makes greater demands of each officer, of his competence, conviction, resolve, readiness, and ability to shoulder responsibility, act independently, and aim for high end results. "...To act with the utmost responsibility, to enhance and improve the skills and combat readiness of all branches and categories of troops" -- this is how the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum formulated the task of Communists and all Army and Navy cadres in the present complex international situation. The Soviet people and our party, the plenum stressed, are doing everything to strengthen the Armed Forces, and are entitled to expect that no aggressive forces will be able to catch us unawares.

To act with the utmost responsibility.... This is addressed to every officer, every commander and chief. To act in precisely this fashion -- this is his duty and obligation. The USSR Armed Forces service regulations emphasize that the commander is in sole command and is personally responsible to the Communist Party and the Soviet Government for the constant combat and mobilization readiness of the unit, ship, or subunit entrusted to him.

There is no such thing as general responsibility; responsibility is specific and takes the form of actions. Its tangible indicator today is a person's position in restructuring, his real contribution to work, his ability to ensure high standards of vigilance, combat readiness, and the proper level of organization and discipline. To act, act, and act again -- this is the main slogan of the day. To act energetically, boldly, creatively, and competently, aiming for high end results both in work as a whole and in the performance of specific combat tasks, displaying persistence, will, and resolve.

It is a fact that by no means all military cadres see their duty and obligations precisely like this. Some commanders and leaders are not sufficiently exacting either toward themselves or toward their subordinates, they overrate achievements, and live in a state of complacency and self-satisfaction. An atmosphere of high-standard organization and performance, unity between words and actions, and a quest for new, more effective methods of work is not being actively and consistently asserted everywhere. Frequently actions are still supplanted by talk and empty assurances and promises. Not everywhere do positive assessments reflect real skill, the readiness and ability to carry out a combat task, or efficiency and reliability of control.

The serious shortcomings of which, unfortunately, there are still quite a few both in the Army and the Navy, where graphically highlighted during the recent incident involving the violation of the Soviet Union's airspace. The aircraft in question was detected by air defense radar facilities during its approach toward our border and Soviet fighter planes circled it twice. However, the flight of the aircraft which violated our airspace was not stopped.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo pointed out in this context that the command of the Air Defense Forces had displayed impermissible compacency and indecision. This incident testifies to serious shortcomings in the organization of standby alert duty to protect the country's airspace, a lack of the necessary vigilance and discipline, and major omissions in the leadership of troops on the part of the USSR Ministry of Defense.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo once again emphasized the fundamental importance of the task of resolutely enhancing the standard of combat readiness and discipline of the Armed Forces, ensuring skillful troop control, and ensuring their constant ability to cut short any encroachments on the sovereignty of the Soviet state.

Specific tasks ensue from this demand for all military cadres and for every commander and political organ and every party organization. It is our duty, proceeding from the positions of this fundamentally important demand, exactingly and in the spirit of the lesson of truth taught us by the congress to assess the state of affairs in every control component and every sector and, relying on the experience of highly responsible people who are setting an example of honorable selfless service, to succeed in the elimination of the shortcomings and to resolutely step up our work.

At this time there is a particularly topical ring for all Army and Navy cadres to the 27th CPSU Congress directive that unless we learn to work in the new way, unless we manage to overcome sluggishness and conservatism in all of their manifestations, and unless we find the courage to assess the situation soberly and see it as it is, we will not be able to advance even one step. In order to ensure that irresponsibility becomes a matter of the past, we must make it our rule to refer to things by their proper names, to stop exercising inappropriate tact wherever exactingness, honesty, and party conscience are called for.

But strictness, exactingness, and criticism of shortcomings are not just essential to us per se. A critical assessment of the state of affairs must become the initial premise for positive action, constructive, energetic work, and ongoing development. Drawing conclusions from our experience -- both positive and negative -- it is essential to channel our energy and activity into specific action of decisive significance for the restructuring process and for improving our combat readiness, enhancing our vigilance, and radically improving military discipline. Today these matters are primarily decided in combat standby duty and combat service, during exercises, on flights, and on marches. Strict, high quality fulfillment of plans and progress relating to combat and political training and of pledges in competition, the guarantee of a high degree of efficiency in every day and every hour of training, and persistent implementation of the principle: Learn what is essential in combat -- this is a real contribution to resolving the tasks which have been set. Only by our actions can we prove our ability to eliminate shortcomings and act in the spirit of the demands of the time.

A task of particular importance is to enhance the vigilance of personnel on combat standby duty. The fulfillment of this task is indissolubly connected with maintaining an enhanced sense of being in the front line and a feeling of personal responsibility for the country's security in people at combat posts. We cannot allow the fulfillment of combat tasks to become an ordinary, mundane matter in the minds of the people concerned. Combat duty requires constant presence of mind, alertness, readiness for decisive action, and the ability to use the potential of hardware to the full in order to prevent any encroachment on the motherland's security.

Responsibility is molded only in an atmosphere of exactingness and specific demands for the fulfillment of professional obligations. It is important to assert this kind of atmosphere everywhere, to firmly and consistently strengthen one-man command on a party basis, to maintain the exactingness of commanders and chiefs, and to achieve the unswerving fulfillment of orders and adopted decisions. A resolute course aimed at getting things organized actually in units, ships, and military training establishments must be adopted in the activity of all control organs. It is impossible to accept a situation in which their attention is often centered on questions of internal life, the resolving of which reduces the potential for work among the troops.

Responsibility does not tolerate red tape. It is the enemy of bureaucracy, endless coordination meetings, or a desire to explain failures in terms of allegedly objective factors. It is the duty of commanders, political organs, staffs, and party organizations to resolutely put a stop to demagoguery, empty talk, generalizations, and inaction.

An urgent command of the times is to intensify party demandingness toward all officials, particularly those in control organs. It is important to constantly remember that the vanguard role of the Communist is not an abstract concept, it is reflected in practical actions. Now, more than ever, Army and Navy Communists must assert in every troop collective an atmosphere of mutual exactingness, implacability toward shortcomings, and orientation toward selfless work for the sake of safeguarding the motherland's security and reliably defending the gains of socialism.

'ILLUSIONS' IN NUCLEAR AGE MILITARY THINKING

PM291311 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 May 87 First Edition pp 2-3

[Article by Professor Colonel General D. Volkogonov, doctor of philosophical sciences: "Imperatives of the Nuclear Age"]

[Text] For many centuries, climbing the endless steps of the pyramid of social progress, a sinister train of innumerable wars trailed behind human civilization. History has known 7- and 30-year wars and even a 100-year war. In the 20th century, two world wars and hundreds of local wars have left indelible scars on the face of the planet, carrying off tens of millions of human lives. But in terms of their catastrophic consequences, all these wars pale in comparison with the threat of an unthinkable but possible nuclear war.

The fateful sequence of these wars and the Damoclean threat of an incinerating nuclear cataclysm have posed with the utmost acuteness and terrible definiteness the question: How is peace to be preserved and strengthened? How is it possible to create a political mechanism to block the source of war through the efforts of those on earth without waiving principles or social and spiritual values? As is known, the answers to these questions are contained in the concept of new political thinking. This concept, developed in the 27th party congress decisions, has made principled amendments to the correlation between war and politics. The new political thinking is not a new world outlook, but a new facet of it which enriches us with understanding of the commanding imperatives (objective demands) of the nuclear age. The concept of new thinking does not go against Leninist teaching on the defense of the socialist homeland. It is important to emphasize this, for articles have appeared recently in our press which, in our opinion, misinterpret the phenomenon of war, the military-political situation, and the social role of the Soviet Armed Forces.

Destiny of War [subhead]

All countries have many monuments devoted to war: to military leaders, heroes, battles. There are no monuments to peace in the true sense of the world. Not only because the best "monuments" to peace are created by people in the form of palaces, dams, roads, and other manifestations of the creative power of human reason, but also because peace has been a rare guest on earth. The flames of war are blazing somewhere virtually always, giving people an awful reminder of its merciless millstones grinding the destinies of a multitude of people.

Humanists, thinkers, and politicians of the past tried to create some obstacles in the way of the chariot of war. In his essay, the enlightener Grotius (1625) urged Christians to resolve disputes carrying a threat of war at special interstate gatherings. I. Kant, the great 18th-century thinker, suspected that military conflicts could be doused if "stable equilibrium" were created. In the course of technical progress and with the emergence of new weapons there were attempts to limit their application. Thus, an appeal was heard at the 1215 Church Synod for a ban on crossbows; the question of a ban on case shot was discussed at the height of the Napoleonic wars; the Hague conventions of 1899 and 1907 prohibited "the dropping of lethal objects from aircraft and the bombing of cities." As long ago as 1930 the League of Nations resolved to destroy all stocks of chemical and bacteriological weapons...

As is known, the bans were not implemented. In particular, because neither case shot nor the "dropping" of lethal objects from aircraft threatened to destroy all mankind.

A fundamentally new situation has arisen in the final quarter of the 20th century. The achievements of human genius, placed at the service of militarism, have created a threat to the existence of human civilization. Nuclear weapons have "outgrown" the purposes for which they were created. The qualitatively new level of development of military hardware has put the destiny of war itself onto a new plane. At a certain stage (and mankind has evidently reached it) there is a boundary, a limit to war. A boundary in the sense that in the modern epoch nuclear war, if we speak of its functional aspect, cannot be a sensible, rational means of policy. Otherwise, as M.S. Gorbachev pointed out in his speech at the forum of peace-loving forces on 16 February this year, "the authors of such a policy will themselves be consumed in a nuclear war." It has become obvious, if you define the genesis and essence of the unthinkable but possible nuclear war, that henceforth it is possible to continue with its help only a crazy, criminal, adventurist policy leading to nonexistence. However, it seems that this is precisely what the militarist wing of modern imperialism adheres to, reckoning on achieving decisive strategic superiority over socialism with the help of new military programs. We have to take the chimeras of such adventurist thinking into account.

Unfortuntely, individual authors concentrate their efforts only on condemning war "in general" and on painting a vivid picture of its apocalyptic consequences without clearly indicating the impact of that global threat. The damning of nuclear weapons outside a political context is also aimless. How, for example, can one evaluate the printed statement by the well-known Soviet writer A. Adamovich, who regards as the duty of literature to "create a moral atmosphere in society, in the world, on the planet, such that it would not be prestigious to have the bomb and no less shameful than concentration camps, death factories, and Auschwitzes are today"?! Here the author says that for the opposing systems to "cease to be mutually threatening" we must start with ourselves. But did we not start struggling for peace as long ago as 1917? As though the famous Soviet plan for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons from the planet by the threshold of the next millennium did not and does not exist! If we follow the writer's logic, only unilateral disarmament (for the West is still not taking steps toward us) can release us from the "shame" of possessing nuclear weapons.

The dialectics of war and peace involve a struggle between two opposites, whose positive resolution is possible only in the sphere of politics. K. Marx was profoundly right when he once emphasized that "war attained developed forms earlier than peace." Countless numbers of folios and treatises have been written on war, and pieces of research carried out. Considerably less has been said about peace. As a state of relations between states, peace exists on different levels in real life: the levels of friendship and cooperation, peaceful coexistence, and "cold war."

The socialist countries are the most consistent expressers of the policy of peace. They have no classes or social groups with an interest in using military violence as a means of solving international problems. Our country personifies the most consistent adherent of peace. As long ago as the dawn of the formation of the Soviet state, V.I. Lenin evaluated the Great October Socialist Revolution, whose 70th anniversary will be celebrated by all progressive mankind this year, as "the first victory for the cause of destroying wars." Today the USSR adheres to an exceptionally clear and precise concept: The immediate task is that of weakening the threat of nuclear war; the next is that of making still more remote the likelihood of one breaking out; and, finally, the ultimate task is that of excluding nuclear war from the life of society. Precisely this could be (and must be!) the evolution of the destiny of war.

But, for the time being, a nuclear world is the awful imperative of contemporary existence. Today our class opponent is still not agreeable to living in a different, nonnuclear world. Therefore, just as it is impossible to applaud with one hand, so it is also impossible to create a nuclear-free world through unilateral efforts alone.

Whether we want this or not, we cannot fail to take this reality into account. Unfortunately, claims are made, as one Soviet author writes, for example, that there will not be peace as long as "each social system insists on its own 'favorite ideas.'" That is, the possibility of preserving peace is virtually dependent on the abandonment of one's ideals and spiritual values. The inadmissibility of such an approach is obvious. Our class approach to peace does not contradict what is common to all mankind. Moreover, the dialectics of the class aspect and the general human aspect in the fundamental question of today are now manifested in the merging of the profound interests of the overwhelming majority of the planet and the socialist world. The conclusion which V.I. Lenin drew as long ago as March 1920 — "... Our peaceful policy is approved by the vast majority of the world's population" — still retains its full force today. It is difficult to understand the author who writes that "common philosophical ground" is needed to build a demilitarized world. The outlooks of the two worlds will remain different. But this does not, however, rule out the possibility of formulating a unified view of nuclear war as an inadmissible means in politics — not just a view, but also real actions aimed at excluding nuclear war from the life of human society. For the time being, only socialism is ready for this. That is the whole point.

Logic of Balance [subhead]

The imperatives of the nuclear age are commanding. They have left their mark on many things: the correlation of forces, modern strategy, priorities of values, future prospects. It is precisely the new realities of our times that have brought to life the new thinking, which is steadily becoming established in the consciousness of more and more people. However, the impression is sometimes gained that the consciousness of those who control the giant U.S. and NATO war machine is in mothballs, as it were. The strong public movements in defense of civilization, the socialist countries' numerous initiatives, and the doubts arising among their own people as to the rightness of power politics "flow round," as it were, and bypass the reason and feelings of such diehards as Caspar Weinberger, for example.

In the book "Nuclear Forces," K. Payne, one of the Pentagon's nuclear planners, argues frankly and cynically: "Despite everything, the United States must plan for victory over the USSR at a price which will enable Americans to survive." And it is planning. More than 40,000 targets, which are kept "in the sights" of the triad of offensive nuclear forces, are marked on USSR territory on the Pentagon's unified, integrated operations map. The preamble to the "Directives on Building the U.S. Armed Forces" states: "In a nuclear war, the United States must gain the upper hand and be able to force the USSR to quickly cease hostilities on terms favorable to us." The document's contents confirm yet again the offensive thrust of U.S. military doctrine, which allows the possibility of destroying its opponent while itself surviving. Such is the reality.

Soviet military doctrine, as a system of state views on military building and on the preparation of the country and its Armed Forces to repulse aggression, is of a strictly defensive nature. It has essentially become a doctrine of preventing war. This finds expression in the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons nor to seek one-sided military advantages and in the readiness to undertake the phased mutual destruction of the nuclear arsenal. The Soviet Union's attainment of parity with the United States was a phenomenon of a special order, because it put the potential aggressor in a position where it could not count on victory. While remaining a military means, nuclear weapons are increasingly becoming an instrument which it would be irrational to use. Our ability to maintain the existing parity and balance deters those people in the Pentagon's bunkers who are still seeking in vain ways to achieve victory.

For us, the phenomenon of nuclear confrontation is strictly a phenomenon forced upon us as a method, a response to dreadful challenges. We are ready, as the 27th CPSU Congress emphasized, proceeding from the principle of equal security and given reliable international verification, to move from the present level of nuclear confrontation to the lowest, right down to the total elimination of weapons of mass destruction.

For the other side, as is shown by the recent visits by eminent guests from Britain and France, as well as by the obvious concurrence in this question of their chief ally on the other side of the ocean, nuclear deterrence is a conceptual, strategic principle.

Therefore, it is hardly correct to examine this process in a nondifferentiated way, as many authors do. For it is a double-sided process: for one side -- a process forced upon it; for the other -- a process with specific objectives [tselepolagayushchiy].

It is only with the help of parity, which the 27th CPSU Congress evaluated as "socialism's historic achievement," that we deter the potential aggressor from taking foolhardy steps. However, placed by the very logic of historical confrontation under conditions where we possess corresponding might, the U.S. and NATO leaders are doing everything to "circumvent," make worthless, and upset the present balance. The whole point is that we want peace without military victory, while the NATO West wants its victory without fail with the help of war or peace (American-style).

The impression is sometimes formed that what Washington understands by foreign policy is just a state of affairs in which one side will be bound to lose and the other to win. But peace is a goal which can only be attained in association. In the face of the nuclear threat everything must be done to ensure that the gain and the victory are the same -- true, just peace. But this does not seem to suit those who are now on the hill of power in Washington and in other NATO capitals. The pooling of the sides' efforts in the struggle for mankind's survival can only be achieved on the basis of compromises, mutual concessions, and steps toward each other, not by abandoning one's principles and ideals. This is why the arguments about peace which are encountered and which do not take account of the actually aggressive efforts of Atlanticists and the militarist military seem strange. Only practical recognition of the principle of equal security provides opportunities for the possibility of an agreement, the possibility of movement toward lasting peace. Such is the logic of balance.

The UNESCO Charter contains a noteworthy sentence: "Thoughts of war arise in people's minds, and so the idea of defending peace must be implemented in people's consciousness." But, in implanting this idea, we must not forget where the source of the wars of modern times lies, who is opposed to the numerous peace initiatives of the USSR and its allies, who needs concepts like SDI, and why. Perhaps human consciousness needs to become global, common, and unified with regard to war, peace, and the future. Through Hamlet's lips Shakespeare pronounced an eternal philosophical question: "To be or not to be?" But Hamlet was thinking of just one person. All mankind must become aware of this question: The problem of survival has become global. The fact that we realized this before our class opponent attests to the more profound humanist basis for the new thinking in our minds. We understand that military-strategic parity is knot spiritual parity. We have had and continue to have an incontestable advantage in this sphere. It consists in our invincible aspiration for peace, the humanism of our communist ideals and goals, and our readiness and ability to defend our spiritual values. In this light, future historians will be able to describe as a colossal success the prevention of the catastrophe that we will not allow to happen.

Arguments of Existence [subhead]

You could say that there exists today a range of several basic possibilities for the development of civilization: peaceful coexistence, brinkmanship, or nuclear apocalypse. Which of these possibilities is realized depends, of course, not only on the people in the Pentagon bunkers; today it is obvious that the solution to the fateful dilemma is determined to a greater degree by those who personify the denial of war as a means of resolving the chief contradiction of the epoch. this is the indisputable argument of our existence. The fact that such an unstable, fragile peace, such as it is today, has been preserved is to a large degree a result of the political will of socialism, its economic might, and the combat potential of its armed forces.

This fact shows the distinctive dialectic of the social role of the armed forces. Having been an instrument of violence and war throughout the history of human civilization (and they remain this under capitalism), under the conditions of socialism, they have been transformed into an instrument of peace. But if the authors of the concepts of "massive retaliation," "flexible response," and "Star Wars" were one day to cross the Rubicon dividing peace and war and proceed to monstrous actions, the Soviet soldiers and officers in charge of the strategic might would be forced to fulfill their duty to the end. This is prescribed by the provisions of our military doctrine.

Unfortunately, certain authors cast doubt on the competence of this concept. For example, the writer whom we mentioned at the beginning of the article considers such an approach absurd and ridiculous. He says that for him "today there are no military men braver or worthier than those who, like retired generals, devote their military knowledge to the antiwar movement." The writer unequivocally believes that there must be no counterstrike. By his arguments he essentially leads the reader toward this thought: Since even a counterstrike is senseless, is readiness necessary?

This is not an original viewpoint. So-called "nuclear pacifists," primarily people of a religious circle, maintain that it is immoral to use nuclear weapons even for purposes of self-defense or retaliation. But it is very characteristic that the purveyors of such views usually turn only to the Soviet Union in the belief that the West will not take any unilateral steps.

The Soviet writer's aforementioned views are a matter for his conscience. However, we cannot overlook the fact that he virtually casts doubt on the expediency of Soviet servicemen fulfilling their military duty; this is no longer a harmless rhetorical exercise.

Thousands of Soviet servicemen enter onto combat duty at missile complexes every day. They are directly involved in tasks of strategic and, I would say, fateful significance. We all hope and believe that none of them will ever have to carry out an order to launch against real targets. But the readiness to do so, as the highest expression of one's military and civic duty, still remains a formidable deterrent factor. Until a political mechanism for blocking war has been created, there exists one indisputable truth for Soviet servicemen in the form of an axiom: The greater our combat readiness, the less the likelihood of a potential gressor undertaking a nuclear adventure. This is one more argument of the nuclear age.

Unfortunately, articles by certain authors without clear class positions are not rare. Here I will make the reservation that we do not see abstract pacificism as an ideological "foe"; rather, the reverse. Nor must we feel to shy to say that such pacificism is not the position of Communists. [paragraph continues]

Otherwise, whether we want to or not, we must share equally the responsibility for the Damoclean threat of the nuclear apocalypse hanging over us with those who are preparing it, for the fact that there is no way the world will see progress toward security, and for the fact that the West is not ready to live in a nuclear-free world. Yet in all instances we have been and are the first to take a step toward a secure world. Can this really be ignored?

Since we cannot dispense with our defensive might, nor can we underestimate the fostering of readiness to defend socialism in the Soviet people. This is not only a sacred duty, but also a profound, vital necessity. The conclusions of scientists published in a popular newspaper appear false in this light. Abstracted from social, demographic, and other factors, the drafting of students for military service in full accordance woth our laws is qualified as a "foolish and shortsighted" solution. It is said that "atrophying and numbing of creative abilities" take place during service. One of the participants in a roundtable in the newspaper in fact poses an inadmissible question: Whom does our society need more: soldiers or learned specialists? If this is a problem for the scientist in question, that is not so serious. But how does such a contrast make it possible to understand the social role of military service? Particularly in the light of present realities?

The readiness to fulfill one's constitutional duty is inseparable from vigilance. No, not from suspicion, but from a genuine class guardedness toward those who are accelerating the "Star Wars" plans and placing more and more new models of refined weapons onto the endless conveyor belt of the arms race, who drew up the Charioteer, Dropshot, and Trojan plans for a preventive attack on the USSR, and who are now preparing models and scenarios for a nuclear blitzkrieg. Therefore, it is distressing that in discussing the topic of the "image of the enemy" (incidentally, this term is not used in peacetime in our propaganda, even military propaganda), conclusions are drawn which do not take reality into account. For example, the record of a discussion on this topic conducted in one journal and the statements by a number of participants contained thoughts with which it is hard to agree. In particular, one of the participants maintained that "at times of drops in political temperature, the editorial office is inundated not with analytical articles, but with readers' letters and cartoons. These materials frequently border literally on combat, front-line propaganda. This is what I would like to warn against." The speaker willy-nilly "warns" Soviet people against displaying vigilance, a direct class response, and guardedness. He "warns" Soviet people who have more than enough grounds for making a sober judgement of the intentions and affairs of imperialist circles.

Realities do not accept illusions. Lenin's words remain topical: "Whoever thought that peace can be achieved easily, that we have only to mention peace in passing and the bourgeoisie will hand it to us on a plate, is quite naive."

The concept of new thinking does not ignore the new realities, but, on the contrary, takes them most fully into account. We cannot reckon that, if we close our eyes to the appearance of those who continue to seek the elusive specter of victory in nuclear war, they will change from that and become different. Regard for this imperative of the nuclear age is not a manifestation of being a "diehard," but a sober assessment of the political situation which can (and must!) change for the better amid the wind of historic changes. We do not simply believe in this; many arguments of today's dynamic existence are in favor of this truth.